DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 963 FL 015 664

AUTHOR De Vries, John
TITLE Towards a Sociology of Languages in Canada.
INSTITUTION Laval Univ., Quebec (Quebec). International Center for Research on Bilingualism.
REPORT NO ISBN-2-89219-164-5
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 196p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Demography; *English; Foreign Countries; *French; Language Dominance; Language of Instruction; Language Planning; Migration; Minority Groups; Official Languages; *Public Policy; Second Language Instruction; Sociolinguistics; *Sociology
IDENTIFIERS *Canada; *Quebec

ABSTRACT

This examination of the sociology of language in Canada focuses on the social or societal aspects of the relationship between languages and society rather than on linguistic aspects. The study is developed in seven sections: (1) an introductory discussion of language and communication systems, language acquisition, messages, and language communities in contact; (2) analysis of the spatial distribution of Canada's language communities; (3) a review of the processes affecting change, including fertility, mortality, migration, language shift, and linguistic intermarriage; (4) an examination of language use in public domains (work, education, mass media); (5) a discussion of age structure and educational attainment as correlates of language characteristics; (6) examination of the consequences of language characteristics in occupational distribution and mobility and in income; and (7) an analysis of language rights and the involvement of the state through language policy. Lack of an integrated body of data about the sociology of language in Canada is criticized. Nine pages of references conclude the report. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED270963

John De Vries

Towards a Sociology of Languages in Canada

Publication B-153

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Bruyiniers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1986
Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme
International Center for Research on Bilingualism
Québec

FL015664

Le Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme est un organisme de recherche universitaire qui reçoit une subvention de soutien du Ministère de l'Education du Québec et une contribution du Secrétariat d'Etat du Canada pour son programme de publication.

The International Center for Research on Bilingualism is a university research institution which receives a supporting grant from the Department of Education of Quebec and a contribution from the Secretary of State of Canada for its publication programme.

© **1986 CENTRE INTERNATIONAL DE RECHERCHE SUR LE BILINGUISME**
Tous droits réservés. *Imprimé au Canada*
Dépôt légal (Québec) 1er trimestre 1986
ISBN 2-89219-164-5)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION 1

Some basic concepts 1
On language acquisition 9
The idea of "messages" 13
Language communities in contact 15

CHAPTER 2
LANGUAGE COMMUNITIES IN CANADA 20

Spatial distributions of Canada's language communities 30

CHAPTER 3
PROCESSES AFFECTING CHANGE 46

Introduction 46
Fertility 48
Mortality 52
Migration 53
Language shift 64
Linguistic intermarriage 74
Summary 78

CHAPTER 4
LANGUAGE USE IN PUBLIC DOMAINS 80

Introduction 80
Language use at work 80
Language in education 89
Language and the mass media 95
Language use and domains: a summing up 99

CHAPTER 5
CORRELATES OF LANGUAGE CHARACTERISTICS 101

Age structure 101
Educational attainment 111

CHAPTER 6
CONSEQUENCES OF LANGUAGE CHARACTERISTICS 120

Introduction 120
Occupational distribution 121
Occupational mobility 129
Labour income 130
Summing up: the benefits of language skills 134

CHAPTER 7
LANGUAGE RIGHTS: THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE STATE 135

CHAPTER 8
SUMMARY 148

REFERENCES 153

APPENDIX 163

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 2.1:
The Ten Largest Language Communities in Canada, 1981 and Their Size in Population Censuses 1931-1981 23

TABLE 2.2:
Amerindian Languages Reported as Mother Tongue and as Home Language, Canada 1981 26

TABLE 2.3:
Home Language Use, Associated with the Ten Largest Canadian Language Communities, 1981 and 1971 29

TABLE 2.4:
Distribution of the Population by Mother Tongue and Province, Canada, 1981 31

TABLE 2.5:
Percentage Distribution of Selected Mother Tongue Groups by Province, Canada, 1981 32

TABLE 2.6:
Segregation Indices between the Ten Largest Mother Tongue Groups at the Level of Provinces, Canada, 1976 and 1981 34

TABLE 2.7:
Population by Mother Tongue and County, New Brunswick, 1981 36

TABLE 2.8:
Distribution of the Population by Mother Tongue and Linguistic Region, Canada, 1971 38

TABLE 2.9:
Distribution of the Population by Mother Tongue and Linguistic Region, Canada, 1981 38

TABLE 2.10:
Selected Language Characteristics of the Population by Region, Canada, 1971 41

TABLE 2.11:
Percentage Distribution of Home Language Use by Mother Tongue and Region, Canada, 1971 43

TABLE 2.12:
Percentage of Home Language Use by Mother Tongue and Region, Canada, 1981 45

TABLE 3.1:
Percentage of Women Aged 15-39 Using Majority Language Most Often at Home, by Mother Tongue and Region, Canada, 1971 and 1981 49

TABLE 3.2:
Children Born to Ever-Married Women Aged 15-44, by Mother Tongue and Region, Canada, 1971 and 1981 50

TABLE 3.3:
Province of Residence in 1976 for Individuals Residing Outside Canada in 1971, by Mother Tongue 55

TABLE 3.4:
Province of Residence in 1981 for Individuals Residing Outside Canada in 1976, by Mother Tongue 56

TABLE 3.5:
Effects of Internal Migration on Language Communities by Province, Canada, 1976 58

TABLE 3.6:
Effects of Internal Migration on Language Communities by Province, Canada, 1981 59

TABLE 3.7:
Characteristics of Internal Migration by Province and Mother Tongue, 1976-1982 62

TABLE 3.8:
Distribution of Quebec's English Mother Tongue by Region, 1971, 1976 and 1981 63

TABLE 3.9:
Percentage Distribution of Home Language by Mother Tongue for Selected Mother Tongue Categories, Canada, 1971 66

TABLE 3.10:
Percentage Distribution of Home Language by Mother Tongue for Selected Mother Tongue Categories, Canada, 1981 67

TABLE 3.11:
Percentage able to Speak English, French, or Both, for Selected Mother Tongue Categories, Canada, 1971 and 1981 67

TABLE 3.12:
Percentage of Mother Tongue Group Shifting to English Home Language, by Province, Canada, 1971 69

TABLE 3.13:
Percentage of Mother Tongue Group Shifting to English Home Language, by Province, Canada, 1981 70

TABLE 3.14:
Percentage of Mother Tongue Group Shifting to French or English Home Language. Quebec, 1971 and 1981 72

TABLE 3.15:
Percentage of Mother Tongue Group Shifting to English Home Language, by Place of Birth and Period of Immigration, Canada, 1971 73

TABLE 3.16:
Percentage of Married Couples in which the Spouse has the Same Mother Tongue, for Couples with Husbands Aged 25-44, by Sex, Mother Tongue and Region, Canada, 1971 75

TABLE 3.17:
Proportion Shifting to French home Language of English Mother Tongue Persons in Husband-Wife Families with Heads Aged 25-44, by Mother Tongue of Spouse and Region, Canada, 1971 76

TABLE 3.18:
Proportions Shifting to English Home Language by French Mother Tongue Persons in Husband-Wife Families with Heads Aged 25-44, by Mother Tongue of Spouses and Region, Canada, 1971 77

TABLE 3.19:
Percentage of Francophones in Husband-Wife Families whose Spouse was of English Mother Tongue, by Province and Age Group, Canada, 1971 78

TABLE 4.1:
Percentage Distribution of Federal Departmental Public Servants within Mother Tongue Groups, by Optimum Working Language on Entry into the Public Service and in 1965 81

TABLE 4.2:
Percentage Distribution of Federal Departmental Public Servants of French and English Mother Tongue, by Frequency of Use of French and English at Work, Canada, 1965 82

TABLE 4.3:
Language Used at Work, by Mother Tongue, Quebec Labour Force, January, 1971 83

TABLE 4.4:
Percentage of Working Time in which French or English was Used, by Mother Tongue and Region, Quebec Labour Force, 1971 84

TABLE 4.5:
Language Used on Current Job, by Mother Tongue and Sex, Canada, 1973 .. 87

TABLE 4.6:
Percentage of Respondents Using the Non-official Language with Co-workers, by Ethnic Group, Canada, 1973 88

TABLE 4.7:
Students Enrolled in Schools with the Minority Language as Language of Instruction by Province - Selected Years 92

TABLE 4.8:
Minority Language Population Aged 5-19, and Enrolment Index by Province, 1971, 1976 and 1981 93

TABLE 4.9:
Distribution of Television and Radio Stations by Language and Province, 1976 and 1982 96

TABLE 4.10:
Estimated Circulation in '000s of English-Language and French-Language Daily Newspapers by Province – Selected Years 98

TABLE 4.11:
Daily Newspapers Circulation per 100 Population by Region and Language, 1981 99

TABLE 5.1:
Percentage Distribution of Selected Mother Tongue Categories by Age Group, Canada, 1976 103

TABLE 5.2:
Percentage Distribution of Selected Mother Tongue Categories by Broad Age-Groups, Canada, 1971 105

TABLE 5.3:
Percentage Distribution by Age Group for Population of English and French Mother Tongue by Province, Canada, 1976 107

TABLE 5.4:
Percentage Distribution by Age Group for Population of English and French Mother Tongue By Province, Canada, 1981 109

TABLE 5.5:
Proportion of Population 15 Years and Over Not Attending School Full-Time, Showing Levels of Schooling, Selected Mother Tongue Groups, Canada, 1971 112

TABLE 5.6:
Percentage with at least some University Education for Selected Ethnic Origin Categories, by Nativity and Mother Tongue, Persons 5 Years of Age and Older, Canada, 1971 113

TABLE 5.7:
Percentage Distribution of Population 15 Years and Over by Mother Tongue and Highest Level of Schooling, Canada, 1981 114

TABLE 5.8:
Grade Retention Rates for Ontario Students Entering Grade 9 in 1959, By Language Spoken 116

TABLE 5.9:
Percentages Failing to use the Reflexive Pronoun, by Grade in School and Main Language used with Parents, for Four Ontario Communities, 1979 118

TABLE 6.1:
Percentage Distribution of the Male Labour Force, by Ethnic Origin and Occupational Group, Canada, 1961 122

TABLE 6.2:
Percentage Distribution of the Male Labour Force, by Ethnic Origin and Occupational Group, Canada, 1971 124

TABLE 6.3:
Mean Occupational Status by Ethnic Origin, Male Labour Force, Canada, 1971 125

TABLE 6.4:
Number of French-Speaking Persons for each English-Speaking Person by Activity Sector and Occupational Level, Quebec, January, 1971 127

TABLE 6.5:
Share of Managerial Jobs Held by Francophones, Quebec, 1967-1969 128

TABLE 6.6:
Average Total Income of the Male Non-agricultural Labour Force, by Ethnic Origin and Knowledge of Official Languages, Canada and Quebec, 1961 131

TABLE 6.7:
Factors Contributing to Income Disparities between Men of British and French Ethnic Origin in Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa Census Metropolitan Areas, 1961 131

TABLE 6.8:
Net Impact of Language Skills on Labour Income, Quebec, Men and Women, 1970 and 1978 132

TABLE 6.9:
Incidence of Low Income by Mother Tongue of Family Head, Canada and Provinces, 1971 133

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This book is an attempt to fill several lacunae. On the one hand, I have found that the subdiscipline known as "sociology of language" has developed, over the last fifteen years or so, without generating a distinctly macro-sociological perspective. There is a fairly substantial and growing collection of books called Sociolinguistics (Bell, 1976; Bright, 1966; Trudgill, 1982; Pride and Holmes, 1972, to mention only a few). In contrast, few book-length treatments have followed Hertzler's A Sociology of Language which appeared in 1965. While it is clear that there is considerable "overlap" between sociolinguistics and the sociology of language (e.g., Fishman wrote books on both subjects), there appears to be a distinction. The "sociology of language" approach stresses the "social" and "societal" aspects of the relation between language and society. In contrast, a "sociolinguistic" approach is more concerned with the linguistic nature of communications, or language use, or of the language-society interactions.

There is a second lacuna I am trying to fill with this book. There is a vast amount of current knowledge about languages in Canada and their social contexts, but this knowledge is scattered across different academic disciplines (including linguistics, psychology, sociology, political science, economics), written partly in French and partly in English (only a small proportion of this material is ever translated into the other official language) and published in often rather inaccessible sources. This book is intended to bring together up-to-date coverage of Canadian language phenomena within a macro-sociological framework.

In the remainder of this chapter I introduce some of the basic terms necessary in the sociological study of language phenomena. These terms are defined and discussed. Chapter 2 contains a description of language communities in Canada, their demography, ecology and social structure. Chapter 3 takes a dynamic approach and analyses the changes over time in these language communities. An attempt is made here to specify the effects of fertility, mortality, migration and language shift on the survival of language communities. Chapter 4 provides a description of patterns of language use in various domains (the family, the school, the work setting). Chapters 5 and 6 discuss, respectively, the correlates and consequences of an individual's language characteristics (such as mother tongue and the ability to speak English and/or French). In chapter 7, the final chapter, we turn to the role of the state with regards to language policies; such policies do affect the life styles and chances of many individuals. We will look especially at the language policies of the federal government and of the province of Quebec.

Some basic concepts

The most essential concept to discuss is, of course, language. To find its definition, I consulted many texts on linguistics. This search produced several interesting findings. First of all, most of the basic textbooks do not provide any definition of the concept. One obvious source for definitions, the International Encyclopedia for the Social Sciences (1968) contains four articles dealing with various facets of language, but not one definition.

A second finding is that the available definitions are generally derived almost directly from the work of the French linguist Ferdinand de Saussure. In his original work, he distinguishes between three concepts: "language," "langue" and "parole" (in French). Translated into English, the first two would appear as "language," the third one as "speech," that is the (spoken) actual use of particular language. The relationship between "language" and "langue" is somewhat tricky: whereas "langue" refers to the system of linguistic conventions by which a language can be described, "language" appears to be seen as some type of super-concept which incorporates both "langue" and "parole." De Saussure's definition of "langue" is "... a system of distinct signs corresponding to distinct ideas" (1966:10).

Perusal of the linguistic literature yields a few other definitions. I will mention several, for us to have a starting point. Sapir states "Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols" (1921:8). Hertzler, to whose book I already referred, defines language as "... the system of rules and principles of construction, classification and combination of the standard linguistic elements" (1965:11). As a final example, consider Anttila's definition: "a language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by which the members of a speech community (social group) cooperate and interact (communicate)" (1972:12-13).

When we compare these definitions with each other, we find several obvious differences, as well as many similarities. All the authors cited (as well as several others whose definitions were not given above) appear to agree that a language is a system, for the purpose of communication. When we inspect the definitions a little closer, we see that some of them refer to a system of symbols or signs (de Saussure, Sapir, Anttila) while one of them refers to a system of rules (Hertzler). It seems to me that a definition of language should refer to symbols or signs as well as to the principles or rules by which signs are constructed, classified and combined.

A second point for consideration is raised by Anttila's definition. He insists on the symbols (which are defined as the elements of a language) being vocal. His justification for this specification reflects his assertion that sound (and spoken language) has priority over writing, since writing is only a secondary representation of the primary speech. Anttila is certainly not alone in this emphasis; it manifests itself in the apparently automatic assumption that the phonetic system is one of the subsystems which make up a language. Other linguists have made similar assertions about writing, for example: "Language is speech and linguistic competence underlying speech. Writing is not more than a secondary, graphic representation of language ...." (Langacker, 1973:59). Although the primacy of speech indeed applies to the great majority of the languages with which we are familiar, this insistence on signs having to be vocal does not apply to all languages and, consequently, should not be part of a formal definition. The obvious exceptions are "sign languages" (for example, those used by deaf-mutes) and "computer languages" (not all of which are strict derivations of spoken

language). Without any doubt, such languages are systems for communication, though their symbols are not vocal ones.

Anttila's definition also raises the issue of "dead languages" by his inclusion of the referent "speech community" or social group. Did Cornish cease to be a language when the second-last native speaker of Cornish died, sometime during the nineteenth century? (Note that the "speech community" or social group ceases to exist when only one person is alive - a community or group consists, by definition, of two or more persons.) Is Old Church Slavonic not a language, because it is not used by the members of any "speech community?" Although we shall see that the idea of a "speech community" is important in a sociological discussion of language, its inclusion in a definition of language appears not to be required.

If we take all the above comments and observations into consideration, we can arrive at a definition of language as: a system of signs (or symbols), and of rules for combining these signs into meaningful statements, intended for communication.

Several terms in this definition need further discussion. We referred to signs or symbols. In spoken and (most) written languages these signs exist as words. Linguists refer to the set of words belonging to a particular language as its lexicon or vocabulary (formally, the lexicon has been defined by some authors as the inventory of all morphemes, i.e., the basic "molecular" units which are combined into words. See, for example, Langacker, 1973:79). While a linguist may be interested in the further breakdown of words into morphemes, phonemes and the like, we shall not deal with that aspect of language. The system of rules within a language may be referred to as its syntax, or its syntactical subsystem (e.g., see Burling, 1970: 2-3). Again, we will not spend time in discussions of the syntactical aspects of language. Spoken language, finally has a further subsystem: the sounds associated with a language form its phonological subsystem.

So far, we have developed the idea that a language is a system, composed of several subsystems. If you are interested in the more detailed study of language itself, you should consult a general text on linguistics (such as Langacker, 1973; Burling, 1970; Hall, 1964). A final term in our definitions which needs some discussion is the word "meaningful." Defining the concept "meaning" is a difficult task, on which philosophers have not (yet) agreed. Rather than attempting to define it, I will give a few examples. I hope the examples will allow us to have a sense of the "meaning of meaning." Obviously, communication involves the sending of a message, by a "sender" to a "receiver." For communication to be effective, the message must refer to identical objects (or action) in the minds of the sender and of the receiver of the message. The message, if it involves languages, involves words (signs) which "stand for" objects, actions, state of mind, and the like. For the message to be meaningful, the sender and the receiver should make identical (or virtually identical) connections between the words in the message and the referents for which they stand. If a psychologist instructs a child

to "pick up the red block," she would normally have a specific object in mind: we assume that there is a red block, visible to the child, which can be picked up. If the message is meaningful to the child, he will indeed pick up the red block (and not the small blue ball or the tablecloth or the typewriter). Note, by the way, that there are some complications with this line of reasoning. If the child picks up the wrong object, or does not pick up any object at all, it is clear that no meaningful communication took place (if you wanted to be more precise than that, you could argue that communication did take place, but that the interpretation intended by the psycho logist and the understanding by the child were not identical). In the case, however, that the child picked up the correct object, this is not conclusive evidence that the child understood correctly - and that meaningful communication had taken place. The child could have understood that something had to be picked up from a table and selected an object randomly from the table. If there were five objects, random selection would have produced the "right" choice in twenty percent of all attempts. For detailed discussion of the "meaning understanding" issue, you may wish to read Hormann (1981).

The idea of agreement in the minds of sender and receiver can be extended to messages which refer to abstract qualities. If I say "I am disappointed that my paper was not accepted for publication," it is obvious that I want to convey an image of a particular mental state (perhaps also a physical state) to my audience. If the message is meaningful to the receiver, he is not going to picture me with a big smile on my face.

This idea of "shared meanings" or "shared interpretation" is obviously an essential one if we deal with communication. Generally, the sender of a message has high expectations that the receiver(s) of the message will attach the same meaning to it as the one attached to it by the sender. For such agreement to be likely, sender and receiver should of course agree on the rules of syntax by which the message was constructed, the meanings of the words used in the message and, if the message was a spoken one, the rules of pronunciation for the words in the message.

What we have developed so far is the idea that languages are "shared" by several individuals (this "several" could, of course, refer to many millions for such languages as Hindi or English). Specifically, this means that there must be at least two people who agree on the basic rules of syntax and on the meaning of some lexicon for something to be a language. In the case of "dead languages," that is languages which are not (currently) used by anyone for regular communication (such as Cornish, Hittite, Etruscan) it means that we must at least have access to a codification of the syntax (a written grammar, for example) and a listing of words with their meanings (e.g., a dictionary) to refer to this as a language.

For languages which are currently used for communication between individuals or social groups, we can refer to the idea of a "speech community," a term first defined by Bloomfield (1933:42) and used frequently by linguists. If we accept the idea that a language need not be a <u>spoken</u> language, it may

be appropriate to use the term "language community," following Hertzler (1965:32-34). (Users of American Sign Language may find "speech community" a totally inappropriate term, for example.) While I will use the term "language community," you should keep in mind that this does not necessarily refer to a community in the sociological or ecological sense, that is "... the structure of relationships through which a localized population provides its daily requirements" (Hawley, 1950:18).

While it is very difficult to specify what the boundaries are for a given language community (i.e., who belongs to the community, who does not?), linguists have generally tried to do this by referring to "native speakers," that is, persons who acquired a language as their mother tongue (the language they first learned to speak in childhood). While this is obviously an empirically and logically easy way to define the community boundaries, it leads to some peculiar instances of inclusion and exclusion. For example, if the only criterion for membership in a language community is that an individual learned that language in childhood, many language communities will contain members who, in fact, cannot communicate in that language with others (this may be the case with children who immigrated to another society at a very low age.). In contrast, some individuals may be excluded from a particular language community if they learned that language at a later stage in their development. For example, the well-known novelist Joseph Conrad would not be considered as a member of the English language community (since English was not his mother tongue), although his work was written in English.

This pair of examples indicates that the criterion of "native speaker" is not particularly useful in the specification of language communities and their boundaries. However, alternative suggestions (such as the use of "main language") have their own preculiar problems, as we shall see later on. In a society such as Canada, with a relatively complex language environment, defining membership in a language community is a fairly difficult problem. As we shall see, this problem of definition is not just an intellectual and academic exercise: especially with regards to the English and French language communities, such definitions and their outcomes have direct consequences for the right to receive particular "services" (ranging from the relatively trivial right to ask for postage stamps in French to the very important right to receive a primary or secondary education in French or English). The various descriptive chapters to follow will indicate several alternative ways to define membership in a language community. We will then see that not all definitions will produce identical boundaries for such communities.

Regardless of the definition by which we determine membership in a language community, it should be obvious that "being a member" of a language community implies "knowing" that language. When we recall that languages are composed of several subsystems (lexicon, syntax, the phonological subsystem), it follows that "knowing the language" implies

(i) knowing at least the basic grammatical rules for the construction of intelligible messages;

(ii) knowing the meaning(s) of at least a minimal number of words;

(iii) knowing - in the case of spoken language - how particular words should be pronounced.

If you think about these criteria, you will realize quickly that they are very imprecise and that it is, consequently, difficult to determine whether a person A "knows" a language E. Many individuals know only a limited set of grammatical rules for a language (in part because many languages have obscure rules which are only applied by very "advanced" users, in part because grammatical rules change, and in part because many languages have rules which are not essential for a proper understanding of most messages). Moreover, most languages have vocabularies which are so extensive that it would be impossible for any individual to know all the meanings for all the words in that language. (This brings up another point: many languages "borrow" or "adopt" words which belong to another language. While most users of English may not have any difficulty understanding such words as "milieu," "allegro," "sauna," they might have trouble with other borrowed words, such as "Weltanschauung" or "troika." The line which separates "generally understood" words from esoteric terms is not a clear one.) Thus, individuals know a proper subset of a language's vocabulary and often do not know all the meanings for every word they know. Finally, there are large variations in the ways in which particular words are pronounced; such variations tend to group together people belonging to a particular social class, or living in a particular country, region, community or neighbourhood.

If you accept the notion that, for any individual, "knowing" a language means that the person has internalized some, but not all, syntactical rules, that the meanings of many words in the vocabulary are understood - but not all meanings or all words - and that an acceptable and intelligible way of pronouncing words has been acquired, you will also realize that membership in a given language community does not imply that any two (or more) such members use exactly the same "vehicle" for communication. If we consider, for example, the English language community, we see that there are clear differences between "Canadian" English and "American" English (i.e., the English used in the United States). There are, moreover, broad subgroups within either large category, so that we can refer to such distinct varieties as those of New England, Newfoundland or the "Ottawa Valley." Detailed studies have been undertaken of language varieties such as "Black English" (Dillard, 1972) and the English of New York City (Labov, 1966). Much finer distinctions may be made.

In general, this lack of total identity between the knowledge of a language of different persons need not interfere with successful communication, but it may do so if the "overlap" is very incomplete. Thus, a speaker of "standard American" may have difficulty understanding the accent (i.e., method of pronunciation) of someone from Australia, Yorkshire or the Ozark mountains, the syntax of speakers of Black English, or some words used

by people from Britain or Canada. The fact that communication generally does not fail is, in a way, a comment on the social nature of language. Communication ususally occurs between individuals or groups of people who occupy either similar positions in the social structure (for example, discussions among students taking the same introductory sociology course in a university) or "complementary" positions (for example, employee and supervisor, sales-clerk and customer). In such instances, the necessary knowledge of the language is likely to be shared to a large degree.

The lack of complete identity of vocabularies is usually not detrimental to communication. The causes for the diversity of individual vocabularies may be found in the differentiation of roles in a society (incidentally, yet another indicator of the social nature of the language). Some parts of one's vocabulary are associated with occupational requirements, others with family life, leisure time activities, education and so on. In addition, some words or expressions are related to the physical environment of the group of language users, other words reflect the current state of technology in their society. In general, it may be hypothesized that the more refined the social differentiation of a society (or a language community), the lower the chance that any two individuals, selected at random from its members, will have identical vocabularies. The same argument probably applies to the identity or overlap in accent and syntax.

In all societies, regardless of their level of social differentiation, messages between two individuals would rarely involve persons selected randomly. (The main exceptions which come to mind are telephone surveys; what was just argued before suggests that considerable "gaps" may indeed arise in these communications between interviewer and randomly selected respondents.) Most of the messages between two persons relate to their relative roles, where shared vocabularies are most likely. Thus, an atomic physicist is likely to use the vocabulary of atomic physics with colleagues, or with other persons with expert knowledge about this subject. She is not very likely to use this vocabulary with her dressmaker, her dentist or the teacher of her children. Conversely, she is not likely to use the terminology of haute couture with male colleagues, the postman or the Roman Catholic priest in her parish.

Moreover, it has been shown that minor "gaps" in a message (whether caused by incomplete overlap in vocabulary or by other factors) can be filled in by "interpretation" by the receiver. Words, or syllables, missing from a message can be filled in without much difficulty in most cases. Meanings of words not known to the receiver may be inferred from the context. This process of inference tends to be more successful when we deal with concrete objects or physical actions than when we discuss abstract concepts (which are, anyway, harder to describe). This difficulty in inferring correct meanings to abstract concepts may, by the way, explain the terminological confusion found in the humanities and the social sciences. Concepts are often not clearly defined (recall the various definitions of "language" which I discussed earlier); sender and receiver (writer and reader, speaker and

listener) do not always use identical definitions for the same concepts (the trouble is that often these definitions are used implicitly, so that the two persons may never realize that the definitions they use are not identical). As a consequence, "communication" may be imperfect, even lead to contradictory conclusions by the individuals concerned.

You may have been made aware of the fact that humans may do a lot of inferring (and, indeed, do so) if you have had to communicate with a computer. Many computer programmes will fail to work, or produce wrong results, or give you "error messages" if you provide instructions which are incomplete, incorrect or ambiguous. For example, the omission of a comma may well produce incorrect output (you committed a "syntax error" by forgetting the comma). The computer programme, in such conditions, has not been designed to make a "correct" interpretation of such errors; in contrast, human language facilities appear to have been "programmed" to provide an interpretation in most instances.

While relatively slight gaps in vocabulary overlap tend not to be detrimental for communication between individuals, difficulties in communication will tend to increase as the difference in vocabularies increases. Thus, the atomic physicist and a sociologist will only rarely be able to discuss detailed aspects of their work with each other (except when they deal with aspects for which they share a vocabulary, such as the effectiveness of deans or the adequacy of the most recent salary agreement). For similar reasons, the sociologist and the geologist will rarely have meaningful discussions about stratification; the computer programmer and the social scientist may have difficulty agreeing what a particular computer programme should do. In all these examples, communication is made difficult because the differences in vocabularies tend to be rather large. Moreover, even words believed to be "shared" may in fact have different meanings for the sender and the receiver.

A final comment on this notion of "shared vocabularies" is in order. While I have argued that no one knows all the meanings of all the words in any language, it is likely that some persons know more words than others. Having a large vocabulary increases the chances that one understands messages sent by others. Having a smaller vocabulary increases the probability that one's messages be understood by others but decreases the chances of understanding messages sent by others with larger vocabularies.

You should be aware that the preceding thoughts and comments do not give a thorough description of what goes on in human communications. Obviously, these processes are very complex. Failures in understanding are not always, and not necessarily, due to the lack of shared vocabularies, nor does a shared vocabulary guarantee successful interaction. What I did was to give you some possible approaches to the analysis of language behaviour in a complex, post-industrial society such as Canada.

On language acquisition

Virtually all human beings acquire at least one language; in other words, they are able to use a language adequately for the purpose of communicating with other members of their language community. The extremely few examples of children who failed to speak any language at a given age are easily explained - several of them grew up in an environment in which nobody used any language (see, for example, Davis, 1948:204-208, for a discussion of two such cases), while others were born with such severe birth defects that they were either mentally incapable of learning to speak or physiologically incapable of acquiring the necessary language skills. With regards to the latter category, the case of Helen Keller has shown that even the combined conditions of blindness and deafness need not prevent the individual from acquiring a language.

We can consider the acquisition of one's first language from several different perspectives. Psychologists (more specifically, psycholinguists in many cases) have studied the processes by which young children acquire and improve various language skills (see, for example, Brown, 1973). Linguists have studied the linguistic characteristics of child language and, in general, the sequences in which language skills are acquired. Given that we are dealing with a sociology of language, I will only give a brief discussion of the social setting in which language is acquired. Using the terminology of sociology, we can state that people acquire a language in several social institutions. A child's first language (in English, as in many other languages, very appropriately called the "mother tongue") is usually learned initially in the family of origin. Traditionally, the family of origin was virtually the only institution in which children under the age of five or so learned their mother tongue. In most cases, the mother was the person who interacted most frequently and most intensely with the young child and who taught the child to use a basic form of the language used in the household. Even in households where two or more languages were used, the language used by the mother tended to be the more influential one in determining the language acquisition of young children. Fougstedt and Hartman (1956) provide some evidence for this in bilingual families in Finland.

Relatively recent changes in the social structures of industrial and post-industrial societies have brought about some changes in this pattern; the effects of these changes on language acquisition have not been investigated very well. For many industrial societies, the labour force participation of married women has risen sharply in the decades following the end of the Second World War. Although the labour force participation rate among mothers of young children (particularly children of pre-school age) has remained much lower than that among married women in general, this rate too has risen. The rise in labour force participation rates among mothers of young children had already been preceded, earlier in the twentieth century, by the nearly universal decline in the prevalence of extended families (the sharing of a residence by members of the nuclear family with other relatives such as grandparents, or unmarried aunts, or uncles). Thus, children of

mothers who are employed full-time outside the home are to a large proportion cared for in another institution, the "daycare centre" or its equivalent. This now becomes the institution in which young children acquire many of their initial language skills and develop their communication habits. To my knowledge, no research has been published on the effects of daycare centres on the language acquisition of young children.

The trend towards the substitution of other institutions, or persons, for the family of origin as the initial institution of language learning by young children is further reinforced by rising divorce rates in virtually all industrial societies. The consequence of divorce is not only that the mother, who is usually given the custody of the children, has to work outside the home in order to provide an income; in addition, the child tends to be deprived of a male role model on a regular basis. While it is the case that mothers have a more significant effect on child language than do fathers, recent research findings have indicated that the language used by fathers also has an impact (see for example, Engle, 1980).

An additional relatively recent change in the language learning environment of young children came with the spread of the electronic mass media. Radio and, more recently, television have exposed very large proportions of the preschool population in developed societies to a range of verbal stimuli well beyond those provided by the members of their immediate family. Such media influences are almost certainly more pervasive in post-industrial and industrial societies than in the developing societies of the Third World. Moreover, they are probably more common in the "core" areas of societies (that is, the more urbanized and industrialized regions) than in the "periphery," and more predominant among children in upper-class families and middle-class families than among children from the working class. While it appears reasonable to assert that the effects of the mass media on the language learning of young children cannot be ignored, no research has been published in which these effects have been analyzed.

Following this initial phase in a child's mother tongue acquisition (involving the family of origin, daycare centres or alternative forms of child care, and the mass media), another social institution begins to play a role: the school. Here again, we should keep in mind that the impact of an institution is not equally strong in all societies: school attendance for children between the ages of five and, say, fourteen is still not universal in all societies. As with the mass media, the influence of the school on language acquisition is probably stronger in industrial, developed societies than in developing societies.

During the period of formal schooling, children add to their language skills in several ways. Obviously, the language of instruction is a vehicle for communication between pupils and their teachers. In this fashion, pupils acquire a vocabulary for several subjects (such as arithmetic, history, physical education or music in the primary school; botany, algebra or home economics in secondary school; political science, mechanical engineering or

linguistics in university, and so on). In addition, most curricula in primary and secondary schools require pupils to study various aspects of "language" as a subject. Through this medium, children study the formal grammatical rules (syntax), internalize various standards regarding the correct spelling of the written language and may be given practice in the writing of sentences, paragraphs or entire essays. These formal studies will, of course, also increase the size of the child's vocabulary, partly through the introduction of new words, partly by the expansion of a set of meanings for a particular word. Children learn, for example, to choose the correct terms, or to use the accepted meaning of words, by the writing of stories or essays on specified topics. Given the variety of ways in which language learning occurs in the school, it may be hypothesized that there is a positive correlation between the number of years of formal education a child has received and the level of knowledge of the language of instruction. This level of knowledge will be manifest primarily in the size of vocabulary and, to a lesser degree, in the command over (and the correct use of) rules of syntax.

While the preceding discussion was centered around very simple ideas on language acquisition and the resulting variation in language skills, it has been asserted that the differences in characteristics of the language used by individuals (de Saussure's "parole") are much more complex. Basil Bernstein, the main author on this topic, states that the language used by an individual (to which he refers as a "code") can be placed on a continuum in which the extremes are called "elaborated" and "restricted" codes. He has developed the contrast between these two extreme types in a long sequence of papers (see, for example, Bernstein 1961; 1965, 1967) in which definitions are developed, modified and refined. In what is probably the clearest statement on the topic, Bernstein asserts that "In the case of an elaborated code, the speaker will select from a relatively extensive range of alternatives .... In the case of a restricted code the number of these alternatives is often severely limited ..." (1965:153). Bernstein includes syntax as well as lexicon (vocabulary) in his contrast between the two types of code. Thus, he postulates that restricted codes are syntactically much less complex, have shorter sentences and make comparatively less use of adjectives and adverbs, than elaborated codes. In addition to reading some of Bernstein's articles, you may wish to read Dittmar (1976:20-28) for a detailed and critical discussion of Bernstein's work.

A reading of the literature in linguistics (and, more specificially, sociolinguistics) indicates that there is no consensus regarding the tenability of Bernstein's typology. A widely accepted alternative point of view is Labov's "variability concept," which Dittmar also discusses in quite some detail (1976: chapters 4-6). It may seem that such a difference of opinion might only be of interest to academic linguists. However, whether one accepts the tenability of Bernstein's typology or not has rather important social consequences. The main hypothesis based on the contrast between restricted and elaborated codes is that children from working class families will enter the school system with a restricted code only, whereas

middle-class children will also be able to use an elaborated code. Since the language used in the school generally takes the form of the elaborated code, and since the performance of pupils is measured in part through their language facilities (i.e., their ability to use the elaborated code), working-class children are expected to perform poorly in school and will consequently have lower chances of success in the labour market after they leave school. Many post-industrial societies have started compensatory education programmes based on the assumed truth of the deficit hypothesis, interpreted in a somewhat peculiar fashion. Put very simply, such programmes are designed to teach children from "culturally deprived" families (which are assumed to be most prone to use a restricted code) the use of the elaborated code. The assumption is then that the acquisition of this elaborated code will enable such children to perform better in school and to have better opportunities in the labour market. The peculiar interpretation lies in the fact that such programmes can at best tinker with the major effects of a society's class structure. Even if the deficit hypothesis is tenable, the cultural disadvantage of lower-class children does not just lie in their grammatical performance or the size of their vocabulary, but also in the scarcity of cultural "goods" in their homes (such as books, magazines) and the economic situation (less money for "luxuries" such as theatre visits or music lessons, greater necessity to earn some income through part-time jobs such as delivering papers), none of which are affected by compensatory education programmes. As matters stand, the available research evidence regarding the deficit hypothesis is rather ambiguous; thus we can not clearly label the hypothesis "true" or "false."

Language learning obviously does not stop when an individual leaves the school. New words, meanings, expressions and language habits are acquired through interaction with friends, spouse, children and colleagues, and by continued exposure to the various media (radio, television, movies, newspapers and magazines). The variety of influences on language learning will virtually ensure that every person has a unique knowledge of a language (the linguists refer to this as an idiolect, see e.g., Langacker, 1973:51).

In contrast to the virtual universality of first language acquisition, the acquisition of additional languages is not as nearly universal. As we shall see, only a minority of Canada's population reports itself able to speak both English and French, the official languages of the country. Although, in addition, many Canadians are able to speak a language other than English or French (as well as English or French), the total proportion of Canada's population which has acquired a second language is well below thirty percent. This, however, is a considerable number of people. Thus, we should think about the institutions in which people acquire a second language. For some, the sequence is virtually identical to the one in which a first language was acquired: in many families, two or more languages are used so often that even very young children learn several "mother tongues" simultaneously. This occurs in many immigrant families, in which parents may speak their own mother tongue - such as Italian, Icelandic or Ukrainian - as well as one of the official languages, English or French. In addition, there

are many English-French bilingual families in those regions of the country in which the French and English language communities are in close contact.

For many others, in Canadian society at least, a second language is acquired in the school, either as the language of instruction, or as a subject, or both. This pattern is very common with regards to the acquisition of the official languages: French for members of the English language community and English for members of the French language community. An important institution for the acquisition of the "other official language" is that of the "immersion school," in which children of English mother tongue receive instruction in French (as language of instruction, rather than as subject) for several years in the curriculum, and vice versa.

In addition to the family and the formal school system, second languages may be acquired in a variety of other institutions. We can think here of part-time language courses, in which many immigrants learn English, or French, or both. Second language acquisition may also occur through interaction with family members, friends or colleagues, or through exposure to the mass media. Such "informal" factors are of course much more influential with regards to second language acquisition than they were in connection with the learning of a mother tongue. This may partly explain why immigrants often speak "broken English" or "broken French": an important source for their acquisition of English or French is often a group of others whose English or French is also imperfect. This "chain" of imperfection may be extended to other immigrants, as well as the Canadian-born children of such parents. With respect to the children, the outcome is often that they have a limited command of English (or French) and also have a limited command of the language which was the mother tongue of their parents. This condition of "double semi-lingualism" can be found among any immigrant groups, in Canada and elsewhere (see, for example, Lambert, 1980:422; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1976).

I hypothesized earlier that the scope and size of one's vocabulary are positively correlated with the amount of formal education a person has received in the language. By a comparable line of reasoning, it may be argued that, in general, individuals are likely to use more restricted codes in their second language than in their mother tongue. It may well be that Bernstein's typology is more effective in distinguishing speakers of second languages from mother tongue users than its proponents claim it to be in distinguishing between members of different social classes.

The idea of "messages"

So far, we have considered a language as a system composed of various subsystems. We also looked briefly at the social environment in which individuals acquire a first (and, to some degree, a second) language. We have assumed that languages exist for the purpose of communication. This communication takes place between human beings (we will not consider somewhat more esoteric situations, such as "man-machine interaction"). Communication

involves the sending of "messages" by a "sender" to a "receiver" (or to several "receivers"). We will not go into great detail about the nature of messages; interested readers may want to consult Rommetveit, 1974.

When we think about the variety of messages which all of send and receive every day, we see that they can be placed on a continuous scale ranging from "private" to "public." At the private end of the scale we find messages between two closely associated persons. Such messages are often cast in terms which make it difficult, if not impossible, for others to understand the correct meaning of the message. In this category we find communications between husband and wife (the message "Not tonight dear, I have a headache" may be the most common "private" message sent between spouses), a mother and her children ("wash your hands before supper") and so on. It is safe to assume that in these "private" messages, sender and receiver share at least one language in which they can communicate and that there is a high degree of understanding of such messages (often developed after many "trials and errors"). The privacy of these messages may be illustrated by the fact that many families have "code words" relating to such things as toilet functions. Many of these code words are not understood by person who do not belong to the household.

Public messages, at the other extreme, are the ones used for interaction in social institutions other than the family. They often (but not necessarily) involve individuals who are not closely associated with each other. As examples, consider a person interacting with several salesclerks and cashiers during a shopping trip, with teachers and other parents at a meeting of the "Home and School Association" and so on. Even more "public" are the types of message sent as "letters to the editor," sermons preached in a church service, the ideas formulated in this book. Many of the messages we receive are public ones, coming from a large variety of sources: commercials and advertisements in the mass media, propaganda sheets from political parties (especially in the few weeks before an election), church bulletins, income tax forms, textbooks, and so on. Many of these public messages are aimed at audiences representing a wide range of social characteristics (education, social class, mother tongue, age, sex and so on). They may, in contrast to the "private" messages, not assume a high level of understanding for specific words or expressions, except if they are intended for quite well-defined audiences. Thus, a textbook on nuclear physics may contain more special terms and formulae than an article on nuclear energy written for a general weekly news magazine.

We can now begin to connect some of the earlier remarks about the linguistic characteristics of messages to the fact that receivers of such messages have social characteristics which may affect their use of language. It appears more reasonable to assume that persons with relatively little exposure to the more elaborated versions of a language (as taught, for example, in the school systems of most societies) will tend to use a restricted code, will have a limited vocabulary and have difficulty understanding messages sent in more elaborated code.

Generally, the senders of "public" messages will use more elaborated versions of the language. This tendency is partly due to the fact that the persons who normally send such messages (government bureaucrats, journalists, academic scientists) are likely to be native speakers of the language and to have more formal education than the average member of the audience for such messages. In part, it is due to the fact that most institutions which routinely send "public" messages have norms about the "correct" use of language (sometimes formally codified, usually informal) which favour the elaborated code. For a clear example of the use of elaborated codes, you might wish to look at laws or other legal documents (wills, deeds, or contracts are good illustrations). Sentences in such documents are usually very complex, vocabulary is often archaic and seldom part of the common vocabulary of a language community. The resulting text is often intelligible only to lawyers and to others who have had training in the understanding of legal terminology. Most other people, regardless of their command over the language, have to consult lawyers to interpret the exact meaning of terms used in legal documents.

This predominance of elaborated codes in the composition of "public" messages may well have effects similar to that which Bernstein suggested working-class children to experience in the school system. It may well be that the correct meaning of many 'official' messages (which includes, incidentally, requests for information such as those found in income tax returns, applications for family allowance and the population census) is not perceived by the users of restricted codes. This latter category, if this line of reasoning is correct, will have an over-representation of working-class persons as well as persons for whom the message is not produced in their mother tongue - immigrants, guest workers, members of minority groups. If we assume that this hypothesis is true, there is obviously great importance in the claims to language rights which have been expressed by many linguistic minority groups in many industrial societies. Since the sender of most "public" messages is probably government (at various levels, from national to local), we will need to consider the issue of language rights in any sociology of language, especially in societies in which several language communities reside. We will do so, briefly, in the final chapter of this book.

Language communities in contact

So far we have dealt, in a fairly abstract way, with the issues of language use within a language community. The points I made were deliberately general, primarily because specific applications lie outside the focus of this book. Moreover, for many of the hypotheses and suggestions we do not have clear empirical findings. While this indicates that many fields in the sociology of language are wide open to empirical investigation, this is not the place to engage in lengthy abstract or theoretical discussions and speculations.

To make life even more complex, however, you should recognize that there are very few societies in which all the residents belong to the same language community. Only small and relatively isolated societies come close to such a simple situation - Iceland comes to mind as the most unambiguous example (but remember that Iceland has an English community of some magnitude on the U.S. Naval base at Keflavik, and that there was a Danish language community in earlier years when the country was governed by Denmark). Canada is a nation-state of moderate complexity with regards to the language composition of its population; it contains many language communities, varying from very large (English, French) to quite small (some of the Canadian Indian languages may have only a few hundred speakers). With only a little bit of thought, you will be able to work out that the presence of several language communities within the boundaries of a nation-state generates a set of new issues. We will discuss the main ones.

First of all, in any society containing more than one language community, some individuals will have to be able to understand at least two languages well enough to communicate effectively with the members of two (or more) language communities. Without the presence of such a group in the population, communication between the language communities will, of course, be impossible. While it is thus necessary, in linguistically plural societies, for some proportion of the population to be bilingual (or even multilingual), there are no general rules indicating how large a proportion must be bilingual for effective communication in the society to be possible. There are also no general rules to suggest which segments of the population (i.e., members of which social class or which occupational positions) should become bilingual. To a large degree, specific answers to such questions are a function of other characteristics of the society. For example, in societies in which the various language communities are highly segregated (especially those in which membership in a language community coincides with regional identity, religion, skin colour or some other characteristic by which members of a population are grouped), the need for a bilingual segment (and, as a consequence, the proportion of the population able to communicate in two languages) will generally be less than in societies where the language communities have low levels of social segregation. Moreover, societies will vary with respect to the relative "production" of bilinguals.

For the segment of the population which is bilingual, we may consider various aspects of social behaviour. Following Fishman, we may ask "Who speaks what language to whom and when?" (1965). Linguists have addressed questions about the choice of language by bilingual individuals through the use of the concept "domains." Domains are sectors of a society within which interaction takes place. While different authors do not agree with each other on the exact number and types of domains which can be distinguished, the general consensus seems to have settled on about seven (though some writers consider as few as five different ones, while others treat as many as nine distinct domains). Whatever the exact number and the specific types of domain may be, we can order them from private ones (such as the immediate family) to public ones (such as the economy, religious worship, education).

More elaborate discussions of the concept of domains may be found in Weinreich (1953); Fishman et al. (1966).

Many societies show a distinct pattern of bilingualism which manifests itself in the use of two "codes," which may be alternative versions of one language, or two different languages. These codes are used in different domains, in the sense that societal norms indicate which code should be used in which domain. In general, one variety is used in more formal or public domains, such as religious worship (often this is also the variant used in writing), while the other code is used in more informal or private domains, such as the immediate family (in many instances, this variant is not used in written communications). This situation was named diglossia by Ferguson, who described the phenomenon for Switzerland, Haiti, Greece and North Africa (Ferguson, 1959:325-340). It should be noted that Ferguson restricted the use of the term diglossia to situations where the two codes are "High" and "Low" variants of the same language; more recent writers have applied the term to conditions where the two codes are, in effect, different languages.

For bilingual individuals, we may consider a phenomenon called "language shift," that is "... the change in the habitual use of one language to that of another ..." (Weinreich, 1953). The process of language shift could involve the transfer of membership from one language community to another one. Note, however, that the use of the idea of a "native speaker," which several authors specified in their discussion of speech communities, would not allow us to equate "language shift" with "change of membership in a language community." With less restrictive definitions, the number of people undergoing language shift obviously has an effect on the size of a language community.

A second aspect of the coexistence of several language communities within one society relates to the role of the state. Societies do not have sufficient resources to send all "public" messages in all the languages used by members of the population. Thus, choices must be made about the status of various languages. Generally, we can distinguish the following categories:

(i) official languages, i.e., those languages in which individuals may communicate with public authorities and in which specified public services will be provided (such as schooling, health services, parking tickets or the proceedings of Parliament);

(ii) national languages, in which some services are given when resources are available and when a sufficient "need" can be demonstrated. Such "national" languages generally do not have the same legal status as the official languages of a country;

(iii) working languages, in which some messages and services are provided for some segment of the population in some regions of the country.

In addition to these three categories of languages, many societies contain other language communities whose language has no legal status at all. Such languages are used primarily in the more private domains, such as the family, the circle of close friends and the local neighbourhood. Finally, some societies contain language communities which have some kind of "negative" status, in the sense that the use of such languages in public domains is prohibited (and, in the most extreme cases, will result in severe punishment).

In Canada, French and English are official languages at the federal level. Several aspects of the legal status of these languages are codified in law, such as Canada's Official Languages Act and the Constitution. At the level of the provinces, French is the official language of Quebec; English and French are the official languages of New Brunswick and Manitoba; English is the official language of the remaining provinces and the Northern Territories. English may be regarded as a national language of Quebec, since some services (in particular: education) are provided in English, although this status is not guaranteed by law. In the remaining provinces, French is either a working language or has no legal status at all. Inuktitut, the language of the Inuit, is a working language of the Northwest Territories. Various North American Indian languages are working languages for the federal government and some of the provincial governments in their communications with Canadian Indians under their jurisdiction. Other languages (such as Italian, Ukrainian, German) have no legal status in Canada.

When we deal with language rights and their implementation at the level of governments and other large organizations, we refer to institutional bilingualism, in contrast to individual bilingualism (which is a characteristic of persons). For institutional bilingualism, the legal provisions may require that particular institutions (schools, the courts, the army, and so on) provide services, send and receive messages in more than one language. Obviously, in such conditions, some employees must be bilingual, but there is no necessity for all employees to be able to communicate in two languages. In addition, the existence of bilingual institutions does not indicate anything about the individual bilingualism of the clientele. Conversely, populations in which large proportions of the population are bilingual do not necessarily have bilingual institutions. The two concepts are analytically and empirically distinct.

There is voluminous and rapidly expanding literature on the involvement of the state in the area of language. This is generally classified under the heading language planning. Within this field, we can distinguish two separate subfields. The planning, and implementation, of the legal status of languages goes under the label status planning. When a public agency becomes involved with the standardization of a language (for example by providing

standards for the proper spelling of words, or by developing standard vocabularies) we refer to corpus planning. Good references on language planning are Rubin et al., 1977; Fishman, 1974; Hobart, 1977; Bourhis, 1984.

We will discuss various aspects of individual bilingualism in Canada in chapters 4 and 6. Institutional bilingualism and language status planning in Canada will be discussed in chapter 7.

CHAPTER 2: LANGUAGE COMMUNITIES IN CANADA

In the preceding chapter we discussed several concepts which may be used in a macro-sociological discussion of language in a nation-state such as Canada. The central concept is that of a 'language community'. Other ones to be dealt with are 'bilingualism' and 'language shift'. Most of what was discussed in chapter 1 pertains mainly to societies with more than one language community; however, this means that it is relevant for virtually all existing nation-states. Canada has what we might call a moderately complex language composition, similar in many aspects to several other nation-states in other parts of the world. In thinking about what may seem to be uniquely Canadian language problems, we may wish to keep in mind that many other societies have had to cope with comparable problems. As a nation-state with two official languages, Canada may be compared with, among others, Belgium, Finland, Israel, Paraguay and the Republic of South Africa. The situation in which one or more language communities are concentrated in specific parts of a country has been handled through the designation of 'regional' languages (which have official status in those regions only), for example in India, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

In addition to the official languages, we find in Canada the languages spoken by Canadian Indians and by the Inuit. These 'native' languages tend to have little or no legal status. Moreover, there are frequently no written versions of them, in many cases due to the absence of any accepted orthography. The presence of such indigenous language communities places Canada in the same category as the United States, most Latin American countries and many countries in Africa and Asia.

The third class of languages one finds in Canada consists of those used by immigrants and refugees. They reflect the patterns of international migration of the twentieth century. The presence of these 'immigrant' language communities puts Canada in the group of industrialized nations, such as the United States, virtually all countries of Western and Northern Europe, Australia, Argentina and the Republic of South Africa. Many western European countries have recently acquired their own equivalent of 'immigrant' languages through the employment of 'guest workers' or Gastarbeiter, whose residence status in the country of employment may be equivalent to that of the Canadian immigrants (as, for example, in Sweden) or provide fewer privileges than those commonly granted to legal immigrants.

Thus, Canadian society has to cope with problems of bilingualism (both individual and institutional), language status planning, the protection of linguistic minorities (in particular, the 'official language minorities' found in various parts of the country), the adaptation of immigrants, the provision of equal rights to members of different language communities. For all of these issues, much can be learned by studying the ways in which other societies have tried to solve comparable problems. The range of possible solutions which have been attempted may offer options which are suitable for Canada's 'unique' conditions. As an example, Canada's Official Language Act calls for the creation of 'bilingual districts', a concept modelled on the 'bilingual communes' of Finland (see McRae, 1978, for a discussion of this transplanting of language policy). In a similar fashion, we can learn some-

thing about the effectiveness of language support programmes for indigenous languages by studying the language policies of Denmark with regards to Greenland, as well as various U.S. programmes in Alaska and Arizona. Problems of language acquisition and adaptation among immigrants and refugees are quite comparable to those affecting guest workers and their children in various countries in Western and Northern Europe. Here again, we may gain an understanding of the variety of possible solutions by studying the experiences of other countries.

When I first introduced the idea of language community, I pointed out that it is very difficult to arrive at a satisfactory definition of 'membership' in a given language community. I suggested that using a criterion such as 'native speaker' was not entirely satisfactory, because it would result, among other things, in many individuals not belonging to <u>any</u> language community. Farb (1974:18-19) uses an even more restrictive definition of 'speech community', by specifying that it is "... not simply a group of people who have a language in common; it is also a community of people in daily interaction and who therefore share rules for the exact conditions under which different kinds of speech will be used." For the kind of macro-sociological analysis which we are attempting to put together, this sort of definition is obviously not useful at all. Not only would we have to distinguish regional varieties and "ethnic" varieties, as Farb does, we would also have to distinguish between individuals by social class (many "language rules" in English Canadian society are specific to a given social class), gender, age, and so on.

Even with a much less restrictive definition, it is almost impossible to give precise answers to such questions as: "how many language communities exist in Canadian society? What are the sizes of the largest ones?" The use of the "native speaker" criterion, which Bloomfield suggested, is less than ideal in any society in which a lot of language shift occurs. As an example, consider the case of an immigrant who settles in Toronto and who, in the first ten years after his arrival in Canada, acquires English, begins to use it at work with friends and in other domains. Suppose that, after ten years, this immigrant uses his mother tongue rarely or never. With the 'native speaker' criterion, this person would not be counted as a member of the English language community. Depending on the exact definition used, and on his ability to use his mother tongue, he might either still be counted as a member of the language community corresponding to his mother tongue, or he might not be counted as a member of any language community. Neither of these two outcomes is acceptable. As we shall see, language shift (primarily to English) is sufficiently common in Canada to make delineations of language communities on the basis of mother tongue (the closest we can come to indicate "native speaker") problematic.

Unfortunately, the available data on language in Canada do not give us many alternatives. The main source of data on language communities is the population census, which has been taken on June 1st of the years ending in "1" (in addition, a more limited census - in the sense that fewer questions

are asked - has been taken in the years ending in "6" starting in 1956). For a general description of census taking in Canada, you may wish to consult Kalbach and McVey, 1971:1-9. For a more detailed discussion of population censuses, Shryock and Siegel (1973, Chapters 2 and 3) is a good reference.

The decennial censuses have contained a question on "mother tongue," starting in 1901 (excluding 1911). The censuses of 1901, 1921 and 1931 defined mother tongue as the language first learned and still spoken; from 1941 on, mother tongue has been defined by the Canadian census-takers as the language first learned in childhood and still understood. Although the general intent has, since 1941, been to ask for the language first learned and still understood, exact question wording has not been identical for all the censuses. Demers (1979) and de Vries (1985) discuss question phrasings in more detail. Both definitions form reasonable approximations to the idea of "native speaker." For criticisms and evaluations of possible losses in reliability and validity, see Demers (1979); de Vries and Vallee (1980:23-28) Even with the census data on mother tongue, it is not possible to guess how many language communities there are, or were, in Canada. Very small communities are not enumerated separately, but are combined as "other." In addition, the "boundaries" between some language communities are rather vague; thus, there may be a rather subjective choice between "Dutch" and "Flemish" (two languages which are mutually intelligible).

In the 1981 census, very detailed tabulations of mother tongue categories were provided, including several with reported frequencies below 1,000 (Byelorussian, Cingalese, Telugu, Swahili). Even here, however, several groupings of languages were listed ranging from "Yugoslav, not otherwise specified," with 43,165 to "Kootenayan languages" with 90. Quite obviously, these miscellaneous combinations contain many tiny language communities.

The most recented data on mother tongue, available at the time when this is written, are from the census of population of 1981. To provide an idea of the (approximate) size of the largest language communities in Canada - defined by means of the "mother tongue" question - I put together the data in Table 2.1, ordered in descending magnitude according to the 1981 census. In this fashion, we can not only get a reasonable idea about the present situation, but also about patterns of growth since 1931.

As you can see, the largest language community by far is, and has been, the English one. The French language community is a distant second, throughout the period for which the data are provided in Table 2.1. Lachapelle and Henripin suggest that the relative sizes of the English and French language communities were, in fact, comparable for the entire period 1871-1951 (1982:13-17). These two groups show up in the Canadian social scientific literature as the two "charter groups."

Following these two groups is a collection of languages which, in Canada, have no legal status. The members of these language communities are, to a large degree, Canadians born outside Canada. The changes in rank ordering, which may be read from Table 2.1, reflect to a large degree the

TABLE 2.1: The Ten Largest Language Communities in Canada, 1981 and Their Size in Population Censuses 1931-1981

Mother Tongue	1981	1976	1971	1961	1951	1941[2]	1931[2,4]
English	14,750,495	14,122,770	12,973,810	10,660,534	8,280,809	6,488,190	5,914,402
French[1]	6,176,215	5,887,205	5,793,650	5,123,151	4,068,850	3,354,753	2,832,298
Italian	531,285	484,050	538,360	338,626	92,244	80,260	85,520
German	515,510	476,715	561,085	563,713	329,302	322,228	362,011
Ukrainian	285,115	282,060	309,855	361,496	352,323	313,273	252,802
Chinese and Japanese	243,870	148,090	111,750	66,955	45,878	55,859	69,281
Portuguese	164,615	126,535	86,925	18,213	150	(3)	(3)
Dutch and Flemish	158,465	122,555	159,165	184,481	100,558	67,772	44,580
Amerindian Languages and Inuktitut	140,975	133,005	179,820	166,531	144,787	130,939	(3)
Polish	127,395	99,845	134,780	161,720	129,238	128,711	118,599
Remainder of the Population	989,555	1,109,770	719,110	592,827	465,290	564,670	697,293
Total Population	24,083,495	22,992,605	21,568,310	18,238,247	14,009,429	11,506,655	10,376,786

Notes: (1) Excludes Walloon.
(2) Excludes Newfoundland.
(3) Figures not available.
(4) Refers only to population 10 years of age and over.

Sources: 1981: 1981 Census of Canada, Vol. 1, Table 1.
1976: 1976 Census of Canada, Vol. 2, Table 1.
1941-1971: 1971 Census of Canada, Bulletin 1,3-4, Table 17.
1931: Seventh census of Canada, Vol. 11, Table 58.

immigration histories of the respective communities. The data for Ukrainian, German and Polish indicate that persons with these languages as mother tongue were among the "early" immigrants (that is, mainly prior to the second World War). This immigration history is evident from the fact that the frequencies for these groups "peaked" in 1961 and declined in the following fifteen years, as the original immigrants died and many of their Canadian-born descendants reported English or French as their mother tongue. Slightly later immigration is indicated for the "Dutch and Flemish" category, whose maximum was also reached in 1961, but preceded by a very large increase in the decade 1951-1961. More recent immigration waves are suggested for the Italians, whose number reached a maximum in 1971 (suggesting that a large number of immigrants arrived in the decade 1961-1971). Following this line of analysis, we can see an even more recent influx of Portuguese immigrants (increasing for each intercensal period since 1951), whereas the Chinese and Japanese appear to have had an early immigration phase (indicated by the slowly declining numbers for the period 1931-1951) as well as much more recent phase (numbers increasing since 1951).

Note that these different immigration histories have produced significant changes in the rank ordering for these language communities (excluding the English and French groups, whos consistently were first and second in size). The Italians "overtook" the Polish group in 1961, the Dutch in 1961, the Ukrainians in 1971 and the Germans in 1976. The Portuguese, with well over 100,000 individuals in 1981, numbered only 150 in 1951. In contrast, many groups which were quite numerous before the second World War declined afterwards (indicating early immigration, accompanied by widespread adoption of English or French as mother tongue by their descendants). For example, there were approximately 130,000 persons with Yiddish as a mother tongue in 1941; in 1981 the corresponding number was 31,490.

While declines in the size of language communities in Canada reflect their immigration histories, the explanation behind this statement should be stated a little more elaborately. What usually happens in these immigrant language communities is that a proportion of the immigrants will begin to adapt to the host society by learning an official language. It is, in fact, more complicated than this: for some "sending" countries, large proportions of the immigrants to Canada already know English and/or French on arrival (for example, immigrants from Germany, the Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries). In many of these cases, the official language is then passed on as the mother tongue of the children of these immigrants. When immigration to the language community has occurred very recently, the community will contain a large foreign-born component. This component will be relatively "young" (since most international migrants are young adults at the time of migration) and will therefore have a low death rate. It will also have a relatively high level of fertility. As a consequence, the language community will maintain its size, or may even increase, after the main wave of immigration is over. For example, the peak in Dutch immigration to Canada occurred in 1952 when over 21,000 immigrants of Dutch ethnic origin arrived in Canada (R.C.B.B., 1970, Table A-1). Although the number of Dutch immi-

grants declined rather rapidly during that decade (5,598 for 1960, for example), the Dutch language community in Canada increased by over 80,000 persons between 1951 and 1961.

If, after immigration has diminished, parents do not pass on their own mother tongue to their children, the age composition of the language community will become an "older" one, with increasing mortality rates and decreasing fertility levels. Eventually, mortality among the immigrants will outstrip the increments to the language community due to fertility (and intergenerational language maintenance). When that happens, the language community will begin to decline in size. According to the data in Table 2.1, this process of decline probably began somewhere in the period 1971-1976 for the Italians, between 1961 and 1971 for the Germans, Ukrainians, Dutch and Poles. Further observation on Table 2.1 will suggest that these processes of decline were reversed for many language communities between 1976 and 1981. However, the data for 1976 and 1981 are not strictly comparable, for the following reasons:

1. Non-response rates for the mother tongue question were 1.9% in 1976 and 1.1% in 1981;

2. The 1.9% who in 1976 did not report their mother tongue were then categorized as "Not Stated"; the 1.1% non-respondents in 1981 were assigned to specific mother tongue categories;

3. In 1981, 2.4% of the respondents gave multiple responses to the mother tongue question (most of these reported English as well as an 'other' language, i.e., not French). While such situations were generally resolved in favour of English or French in 1976, the editing procedures used in 1981 were more favourable to the "other" languages.

The final 'language community' for which data are given in Table 2.1 is the one labelled "Amerindian languages and Inuktitut," which contained well over 100,000 members from 1941 on. This category contains, of course, very few foreign-born members and cannot be counted as an immigrant language community. Moreover, the numbers reported in Table 2.1 for this category are quite misleading. They reflect the aggregation of frequencies for many small language communities to one overall category. Such grouping together makes little linguistic sense, since many of the languages are not related to each other. It makes as little sense as would the grouping together of many languages as "European," which would then combine English, French, Italian, German, Ukrainian, Hungarian, Welsh, plus a host of other languages. The various Indian languages are at least as different from each other as Polish is from English; the differences between Inuktitut and the Indian languages may be as large as those between Finnish and Russian. Before the 1981 census, it was not possible to decompose this grab-bag of language communities into more linguistically homogenous components; in 1981, much more

detailed subdivisions were provided, at least at the national level. I have given these in Table 2.2.

TABLE 2.2: Amerindian Languages Reported as Mother Tongue and as Home Language, Canada 1981

	Mother Tongue	Home Language
Total	122,205	92,200
Algonkian languages	99,200	79,465
Cree	65,950	51,550
Ojibway	19,535	13,490
Algonkian, n.o.s.	13,715	12,960
Athapaskan Languages	11,720	8,620
Haida Languages	335	135
Iroquoian Languages	5,925	2,710
Kootenayan Languages	90	40
Salishan Languages	745	310
Siouan Languages	1,560	990
Tlingit Languages	125	35
Tsimshian Languages	1,545	1,050
Wakashan Languages	950	320

Source: 1981 Census of Canada, Vol. 1, Tables 1 and 6.

Obviously, only Cree and Ojibway form reasonably large language communities, regardless of measurement criterion. Even these two, however, remain much smaller than the larger immigrant communities. For the smaller language communities, we are obviously talking about extremely low frequencies. Vallee attempted to identify the most common languages named as mother tongue by Canadian Indians in the census of 1971, by combining information about tribal residence with the census data on "Native Indian" mother tongue. He produced a list of 31 languages (Vallee and de Vries, 1977: Table B10). When we recall that the total number of persons claiming an Indian language or Inuktitut as mother tongue was only 179,820 in 1971, it should be immediately obvious that most of these 31 language communities have been quite small, in particular if we assume that Cree and Ojibway together may have taken up close to half of these persons.

Just to give an idea of both the magnitudes involved and the rather low reliability of these small figures, I compiled some data on one group. Vallee reports about 700 people of Native Indian ethnic origin in the British Columbia district of Okanagan-Similkameen. These people are almost certainly Okanagan Indians. The census data for 1971 also indicate that only

slightly less than half of the Indians (by ethnic origin) in this district report an Indian mother tongue. In other words, the Okanagan language community determined by mother tongue in Canada numbered only about 350 in 1971. Vallee's data furthermore lead us to believe that fewer than 100 persons spoke Okanagan most often at home.

To illustrate the uncertainty surrounding this kind of estimate of the size of a language community, I checked some alternative estimates of the number of Okanagan speakers. Kloss and McConnell are editing a multi-volume documentation of the "Linguistic Composition of the Nations of the World" in which volume 2 deals with North America. They report on Okanagan speakers in three locations:

(i) page 110 gives estimates for British Columbia, which range from 1,000 to 2,000;

(ii) page 320 provides a figure for the United States of 1,400;

(iii) page 857 gives "multinational figures" for the United States and Canada combined. These figures again range between 1,000 and 2,000.

Obviously, these figures are inconsistent with each other. Moreover, further checking of sources indicates that each one of the figures may be a vast overestimation of the number of speakers of Okanagan. For example, registration data for the Indian bands with Okanagan "linguistic affiliation" give values of about 1,500 for 1967, 1969 and 1970 (DIAND, 1967, 1969, 1970). However, this source specifies that "... many Indians no longer speak their traditional languages ..." (DIAND, 1970:5). In short, the size of the Okanagan language community in Canada, as defined by mother tongue, may not be known with any degree of certainty, but is likely to be below 500. In general, the size of these North American language communities is small; their average is probably no more than about 5,000 individuals.

The census data on mother tongue, though not strictly comparable across all censuses, provide us with information on Canada's language communities for over half a century. While the frequencies do relate to some approximation to the "native speaker" concept, the data do not give us any information about current language use. As I already argued before, many language communities are undergoing language shift and, as such, their size may not be correctly indicated by a count of "native speakers." Unfortunately, the amount of information on current language use is very minimal. In the 1971 census, a question was introduced about the "language spoken most often in the home." This question was repeated, almost identically, in 1981. Obviously, language use in the home only gives us information about one domain, but it is the most private of domains and probably gives us the largest measure of language use for languages other than English or French. As we shall see in later chapters, members of language communities other than English or French usually have to use one of the official languages in the

more public domains such as work, education, health care and interacting with various government departments. It is likely that, for many immigrants, the "unofficial" language will have precedence over English or French in the more private domains of religious worship and the interaction with friends or relatives.

Table 2.3 gives the data on the languages spoken most often in the home, for 1971 and 1981, for the same languages included in Table 2.1.

Several observations may be made on the basis of this table. First of all, the different frequencies for "mother tongue" and "home language" for the various languages illustrate the difficulty, and to some degree the arbitrariness, in specifying the "boundaries" of a language community. The differences between the two frequencies are especially large for the languages associated with "early" immigration: Dutch, German, Ukrainian and Polish. For all of these categories, a measure based on current home language use would indicate language community sizes less than half of those which the mother tongue criterion gave. It is only for the "charter groups," the native people, recent immigrant groups and groups which are culturally distinct from the dominant Canadian culture, that the two measures yield similar values.

A second observation may be made on the basis of this discrepancy between measures based on "mother tongue" and those based on "home language": whatever definition of "language community" we settle on, it should be clear that communities measured according to that definition will not have sharply defined "boundaries." Consider that every person has at least one mother tongue (as defined by the Canadian census question). In addition, every person speaks at least one language "most often in the home." Any discrepancy between the frequencies for "mother tongue" and "home language," for the same language, indicates a person who uses a language other than his mother tongue most often in the home. It may well be that many of these persons are capable, perhaps even fluent, users of at least two languages. They may well belong to two language communities (or even more). Most of these persons are bilingual and capable of communication with the members of more than one language community.

If we inspect the frequencies in Table 2.3 a little more carefully, we see that all of the "unofficial" language communities have higher frequencies on the mother tongue criterion than on the home language criterion, showing a shift away from these non-official languages with regards to current language use in the home. In fact, the only language community which "gains" in this comparison is the English one. More detailed analyses have shown that, indeed, the largest amount of language shift (from one mother tongue to another home language) is from various "non-official" mother tongues to English: for all of Canada, English "gained" in 1971 about 1,286,100 individuals from the non-official mother tongues (but "lost" about 85,400 individuals who reported having English as mother tongue but a language other than English or French as their home language). In 1981, these values both increased, to 1,496,100 and 109,200 respectively. Thus the net gain for

TABLE 2.3: Home Language Use, Associated with the Ten Largest Canadian Language Communities, 1981 and 1971

Language	1981 Mother Tongue	1981 Home Language	1981 HL as % of MT	1971 Mother Tongue	1971 Home Language	1971 HL as % of MT
English	14,750,495	16,425,905	111.3	12,973,810	14,446,235	111.3
French	6,176,215	5,923,010	95.9	5,793,650	5,546,025	95.7
Italian	531,285	364,575	68.6	538,360	425,230	79.0
German	515,510	163,550	31.7	561,085	231,350	38.0
Ukrainian	285,115	94,565	33.2	309,855	144,755	46.7
Chinese and Japanese	243,870	198,085	81.2	111,750	88,390	79.1
Portuguese	164,615	130,890	79.5	86,925	74,760	86.0
Dutch and Flemish	158,465	26,420	16.7	159,165	39,365	24.7
Amerindian Languages and Inukitut	140,975	109,225	77.5	179,820	137,285	76.3
Polish	127,395	55,720	43.8	134,780	70,960	52.6

Sources: 1981: 1981 Census of Canada, Vol. 1, Tables 1 and 6.
1971: 1971 Census of Canada, Special Bulletin SP-6, Table 1.

English increased from about 1.2 million in 1971 to almost 1.4 million in 1981.

In addition, English gained from the French mother tongue community. In 1971, about 347,300 persons shifted from French mother tongue to English home language, only partly offset by about 69,300 persons who shifted from English mother tongue to French home language; the net gain for English here was about 280,000 persons. In 1981, all these values increased: about 411,000 from French mother tongue to English home language, about 123,000 from English to French, net gain for English about 288,000 persons.

The French language community lost, obviously, to English home language, but gained a little from the non-official languages: a little over 30,000 in 1971, just over 35,000 in 1981. Kralt (1976:36-38) provides more detailed analyses of these shifts for 1971.

Finally, we may infer that language communities in which the "home language" frequency is substantially below that based on "mother tongue" (such as Dutch and German) are not likely to survive very long, unless their numbers are boosted through heavy immigration. It is logical that parents who have already shifted from some other mother tongue to English home language will raise their children in English, rather than in the non-official mother tongue.

Spatial distributions of Canada's language communities

The foregoing description may have given an impression that there are many language communities, all of which are widely dispersed over the vast Canadian territory. The impression is obviously incorrect. Aside from the fact that the Canadian population is concentrated in a relatively narrow band of about 200 kilometers North of the border with the United States, the various language communities are rather highly segregated from each other. Let us consider the distribution of the population by mother tongue and province, for 1981, using the same major groups which were used in Table 2.1. The data are given in Table 2.4.

You will note the concentration of the French language community in the province of Quebec (which contained almost 85 percent of the entire French mother tongue population in 1981), the Italians in Quebec and Ontario, the Ukrainians in the western provinces, the Native Canadians in the Prairie provinces and the Northern Territories. To facilitate this type of analysis, I constructed Table 2.5, which gives the percentage distribution for these language communities by province. It shows, clearer than the frequencies do, the concentration of the recent immigrant groups in the "central" provinces of Quebec and Ontario: these two provinces contain 62 percent of the total population, but almost 90 percent of the Italians and 84 percent of the Portuguese.

TABLE 2.4: Distribution of the Population by Mother Tongue and Province, Canada, 1981
(Ten Largest Mother Tongue Categories Only)

	English	French	Italian	German	Ukrainian	Chinese and Japanese	Portuguese	Dutch and Flemish	Amerindian and Inuktitut	Polish	Total Population
Total	14,750,495	6,176,215	531,285	515,510	285,115	243,870	164,615	158,465	140,975	127,395	24,083,495
Newfoundland	556,940	2,690	-------	-------	-------	460	-------	-------	-------	-------	563,745
Prince Edward Island	113,995	5,910	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	490	-------	-------	121,220
Nova Scotia	786,025	35,695	1,030	1,780	670	1,120	-------	2,020	2,675	645	839,800
New Brunswick	448,880	231,945	-------	1,290	-------	655	-------	820	1,025	-------	689,375
Quebec	694,915	5,248,440	134,370	24,080	10,580	15,535	25,470	5,485	24,220	14,965	6,369,070
Ontario	6,598,910	467,885	341,035	171,440	78,955	97,660	112,715	87,120	16,645	73,415	8,534,260
Manitoba	727,165	51,990	6,415	74,180	56,865	6,280	6,940	8,105	24,900	11,830	1,013,705
Saskatchewan	762,160	25,325	1,370	59,160	44,175	5,405	470	3,095	22,400	5,080	956,440
Alberta	1,794,915	60,900	15,905	90,410	66,680	30,700	5,140	23,555	22,605	13,015	2,213,650
British Columbia	2,221,780	43,695	30,505	91,685	26,590	85,445	13,130	29,115	7,160	8,140	2,713,615
Yukon	20,165	520	-------	580	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	23,070
Northwest Territories	24,650	1,235	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	17,250	-------	45,540

Source: 1981 Census of Canada, Vol. 1, Table 2.

TABLE 2.5: Percentage Distribution of Selected Mother Tongue Groups by Province, Canada, 1981

	English	French	Italian	German	Ukrainian	Chinese and Japanese	Portuguese	Dutch and Flemish	Amerindian and Inuktitut	Polish	Total Population
Newfoundland	3.8	0.0	--	--	--	0.2	--	--	--	--	2.3
Prince Edward Island	0.8	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	0.2	--	--	0.5
Nova Scotia	5.3	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.5	--	1.2	1.9	0.5	3.5
New Brunswick	3.0	3.7	--	0.2	--	0.3	--	0.5	0.7	--	2.8
Quebec	4.7	85.0	25.3	4.7	3.7	6.4	15.5	3.5	17.2	11.7	26.4
Ontario	44.7	7.6	64.2	33.3	27.7	40.0	68.5	54.5	11.8	57.6	35.4
Manitoba	4.9	0.8	1.2	14.4	20.0	2.6	4.2	5.0	17.7	9.3	4.2
Saskatchewan	5.2	0.4	0.3	11.3	14.8	2.2	0.3	2.0	15.9	4.0	4.0
Alberta	12.2	1.0	3.0	17.5	23.4	12.6	3.1	14.8	16.0	10.2	9.2
British Columbia	15.1	0.7	5.7	17.8	9.3	35.0	8.0	18.2	5.1	6.4	11.3
Yukon	0.1	0.0	--	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.1
Northwest Territories	0.2	0.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	12.2	--	0.2
Total	100.0	99.9	99.9	99.6	99.1	99.8	99.6	99.9	98.5	99.7	99.9

Source: Table 2.4.

In contrast, the Prairie provinces show the relative concentration of the earlier immigrant groups. Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta together contain 17 percent of the total population; we do find high concentrations here of Germans (43 percent), Ukrainians (62 percent) and Poles (23 percent). In addition, we see the concentrations of Native Canadians in these same three provinces (50 percent). The Chinese and Japanese are relatively strongly concentrated in British Columbia, which contains 11 percent of the total population, but 35 percent of the population of Chinese and Japanese mother tongue. The Dutch, finally, show the concentration in Ontario which we saw for several other immigrant groups, but they have the lowest relative concentration in Quebec, which contains only 3.5 percent of the Dutch mother tongue population.

We can utilize the percentage distributions in Table 2.5 further, to indicate the degree to which these language communities are segregated from each other. Table 2.6 gives the segregation indexes for the ten groups, using the percentage distribution by province. For comparison, these data are given for 1976 and for 1981.

The segregation index is based on a comparison of the percentage distributions; it has a theoretical minimum value of 0 (for the case in which the percentage distributions are identical) and a maximum value of 100 (for the case in which the two groups being compared are completely segregated). For more detailed explanations of the segregation index and its calculation, see Shryock and Siegel, 1973:232-233. A quick verbal interpretation of a specific value for the segregation index goes like this: from Table 2.6 we see that the English and the French language communities had a segregation index of 79.0 in 1976. This means that at least 79 percent of the English group (or of the French groups) would have to be relocated to a different province for the two percentage distributions to be equal.

As segregation indices go, many of the values in Table 2.6 are quite high. Especially the French language community was clearly segregated from all of the other groups - the lowest value found for the French was 63.4 (with Italian, for 1976). These segregation patterns persisted from 1976 to 1981. In fact, the French mother tongue community became slightly more segregated from most other groups during this period. Aside from the high segregation levels for the French language community, we note relatively high indices for the Native Canadians, especially from the recent immigrant categories of Portuguese, Italians and Chinese. High levels of segregation are also found between Ukrainians and the Mediterranean immigrant groups.

At the low end of the segregation scale we find very few pairs. No index obtained a value less than 10; the minimum value observed was between the Italians and the Portuguese: 10.0 in 1981, 10.9 in 1976. Other relatively low values to note are those for Germans and Ukrainians, both with concentrations in the Prairie provinces (indices of 15.5 for both censuses) and for Dutch and Flemish with English (16.2 in 1976, 15.6 in 1981).

TABLE 2.6: Segregation Indices between the Ten Largest Mother Tongue Groups at the Level of Provinces Canada, 1976 and 1981.

	English	French	Italian	German	Ukrainian	Chinese and Japanese	Portuguese	Dutch and Flemish	Amerindian and Inuktitut	Polish
English	--	79.0	38.3	26.9	40.0	24.0	33.6	16.2	44.0	22.5
French	81.0	--	63.4	84.0	85.0	80.4	74.2	84.6	74.4	77.0
Italian	40.1	64.0	--	52.6	58.8	43.1	10.9	32.2	60.9	20.9
German	24.0	84.2	51.5	--	15.5	19.0	48.0	23.6	26.0	31.9
Ukrainian	36.4	85.5	58.1	15.5	--	44.6	54.4	38.5	18.1	38.4
Chinese and Japanese	22.0	82.2	43.1	25.9	40.8	--	40.1	23.0	49.6	31.9
Portuguese	34.6	74.0	10.0	46.0	52.1	39.4	--	27.8	54.5	18.0
Dutch and Flemish	15.6	84.7	31.5	22.7	36.6	20.1	26.0	--	46.7	18.0
Amerindian and Inuktitut	52.5	70.9	61.1	35.3	25.8	58.3	59.6	56.0	--	39.1
Polish	24.3	77.2	20.2	31.4	37.6	33.5	16.3	17.8	45.9	--

Note: Upper triangle refers to 1976 data, lower triangle to 1981 data.

Source: 1981: Table 2.4.

In this discussion, it should be noted that the segregation indices reported in Table 2.6 are minimum values, since they are based on extremely large areal units. What the value of 81.0 for English-French segregation in 1981 means is that 81 percent of one of these groups would have to move to a different province for the provincial distributions in Table 2.5 to be equal. These indices say nothing about segregation within provinces. Thus, if we were to take smaller areal units, such as counties, the values of the segregation indexes for the groups used in Table 2.6 would not decrease, but many of them would increase. If we were to use even lower levels of aggregation (say, census subdivision, or residential blocks), many segregation indexes would increase even farther.

This exercise is not just to be seen as a relatively mechanical production of a matrix of segregation indices. Very obviously, the range of values noted in Table 2.6 does reflect a real variation in regular contact between members of various language communities. The fact that all of the immigrant groups have high segregation indexes - even at the level of provinces - with the French language community suggests that there is relatively little contact between these groups and the French. As a consequence, we should not expect large proportions of the members of these language communities to be able to speak French. If the rank-ordering of the segregation indices has any utility, we should expect the highest proportions with a knowledge of French among the Italians, the lowest proportions among the Germans, Dutch and Ukrainians. Given the considerably lower levels of segregation between the immigrant groups and the English, we should expect more interaction between these immigrant communities and English; as a consequence, we should expect much larger proportions with a knowledge of English. In terms of rank-ordering again, we should expect to find highest proportions for the Dutch, lowest proportions for the Italians and the Native Indians.

Since the provinces are extremely large aggregations, which do not tell us terribly much about the chances of regular contact between members of different language communities, it is worthwhile to consider lower-level groupings. The trouble with moving to the level of counties and census divisions is that the number of units increases rather dramatically, so that tabular representations become cumbersome or impossible. However, such a breakdown is not really necessary. Obviously, there are broad regions in the country in which the linguistic composition of the population is such that a further breakdown will not tell us more. Consider the Atlantic provinces. We find that they contain 12.9 percent of the English mother tongue category, but only 4.4 percent of the French, and even less of the immigrant communities (0.2 percent for Italian and Ukrainian, 0.5 percent for German, and so on). Obviously, whatever contact there is between immigrant languages and English or French, little of it will take place in the Atlantic provinces. This picture is not likely to change appreciably if we were to subdivide the Atlantic provinces into their counties: since there are, for example, fewer than 1,000 persons with Portuguese mother tongue in the Atlantic provinces combined, subdividing them over many counties will not increase their number nor will it tell us more about Portuguese-English

language contact. The only groups with a "sizeable" concentration in the Atlantic provinces, aside from the English, are the French in New Brunswick. Thus, it will make some sense to look at a finer distribution in New Brunswick, to consider more detailed aspects of English-French segregation. As it turns out, a division of the counties of New Brunswick into two categories is all we need. The great majority of the French language community in New Brunswick lives in the seven counties in the North of the province (Gloucester, Kent, Madawaska, Northumberland, Restigouche, Victoria and Westmorland), while the remaining counties contain very few persons of French mother tongue. You can see the results in Table 2.7: the Northern counties contain less than half of the English mother tongue population of New Brunswick, but over 90 percent of the French mother tongue population. The remaining counties contain about six percent of New Brunswick's population of French mother tongue.

TABLE 2.7: Population by Mother Tongue and County, New Brunswick, 1981

	Total	English	French	Other
Total Province	696,403	453,310	234,030	9,060
Gloucester	86,156	15,350	70,490	315
Kent	30,799	6,065	24,220	515
Madawaska	36,432	2,220	34,120	90
Northumberland	54,134	38,970	14,110	1,055
Restigouche	40,593	15,925	24,435	235
Victoria	20,815	11,570	8,715	525
Westmorland	107,640	63,190	43,275	1,170
Rest of Province	319,834	300,020	14,665	5,155

Source: 1981 Census of Canada, Vol. 3, Table 1.

The sensible thing is, thus, to group together the provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia, as well as the Southern counties of New Brunswick. This "region" will then be marked by the extreme dominance of the English language community and the virtual absence of any other language communities. Moreover, the persons not counted in the English mother tongue community will be dispersed over three and one-half provinces. By similar lines of argument, we can subdivide the rest of the country, on the basis of data for counties and census divisions, and then put the pieces together to form relatively homogeneous regions. Such and exercise was undertaken by, among others, Richard Joy (1972:17-21), Lachapelle and Henripin (1982:314-319) and by Driedge, Vallee and de Vries (forthcoming). The resulting regions, produced by these authors, are not entirely identical, since the criteria by which the regions were defined were not identical. There is, however, considerable overlap between them.

The regional groups produced by Driedger, Vallee and de Vries give us six regions, with the following characteristics:

(1) English Maritimes: heavy concentration of the English and French language community; virtual absence of others;

(2) Bilingual Belt: an area in which the English and French language communities are both represented by large numbers. In addition, this is an area in which there are many recent immigrants. The region is made up of counties in Northern New Brunswick, Southern Quebec (including several counties in the Montreal metropolitan area), Eastern and Northern Ontario;

(3) The Quebec Heartland: a region with a very heavy concentration of the French language community, to the virtual exclusion of others. This region is composed of virtually all of the counties of Quebec not included in the Bilingual Belt;

(4) Upper Canada: virtually all of the Ontario counties not included in the Bilingual Belt. Concentration of English, as well as immigrant language communities (with relatively large groups of recent immigrants);

(5) Western Canada: heavy concentration of English, as well as immigrant language communities (primarily earlier immigrant groups). This region is composed of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, with the exception of the most Northern census divisions;

(6) Northern Canada: the region in which we find the largest concentration of Native people, together with English. This region is composed of the most Northern parts of Newfoundland (Labrador), Quebec, Ontario and the Western provinces, as well as the Northern Territories.

Appendix A gives the exact allocation of the counties and census divisions to the different regions (note that these regions were determined on the basis of the 1971 system of counties and census divisions. The breakdowns for 1976 and 1981 differ somewhat from that used in 1971 for Quebec and Manitoba, with changes primarily affecting the composition of "Northern Canada").

Based on these six regions, we can now consider the population distribution, by mother tongue, for 1971. For the sake of simplicity, we will only consider the English and French categories separately and group together all the other groups as "other." Consider Table 2.8. The data show very clearly that the English language community is represented in each region by large numbers.

TABLE 2.8: Distribution of the Population by Mother Tongue and Linguistic Region, Canada, 1971

	English	French	Other	Total
Northern Canada	333,950	218,790	155,745	708,485
Western Canada	4,188,105	156,195	1,032,310	5,376,610
Upper Canada	5,226,570	153,930	1,132,330	6,512,830
Bilingual Belt	1,579,060	3,186,110	453,595	5,218,765
Quebec Heartland	43,350	2,014,775	10,345	2,068,470
English Maritimes	1,596,420	62,900	23,820	1,683,140
Total	12,967,455	5,792,700	2,808,145	21,568,300

Source: 1971 Census of Canada, Bulletin 1.3-4, Table 20.

It is heavily overrepresented in Western Canada, Upper Canada and the English Maritimes, underrepresented in Northern Canada (where most of the "Others" are Inuit and Indians) and the Bilingual Belt, and severely underrepresented in the Quebec Heartland (where we find virtually only residents of French mother tongue). The French language community is largely concentrated in the Bilingual Belt and the Quebec Heartland; in the former of these two regions, there are sizeable groups of English and "other" mother tongues as well, whereas in the latter region very few others are found. The "other" language communities are overrepresented in the North, Western Canada and Upper Canada. Of these, the North contains a large concentration of Native people, Western Canada of earlier immigrant language communities, Upper Canada of more recent language communities. We can draw up the same table for 1981. As I remarked earlier, the regional composition for the censuses of 1976 and 1981 differs slightly from that for 1971. This difference affects the Northern region, the Quebec Heartland and the West. Numerically, the impact on each of these regions is very small. Table 2.9 gives the distribution of the population by mother tongue for 1981.

TABLE 2.9: Distribution of the Population by Mother Tongue and Linguistic Region, Canada, 1981

	English	French	Other	Total
Northern Canada	422,445	240,050	130,200	792,695
Western Canada	5,212,170	163,970	1,136,895	6,513,035
Upper Canada	5,792,995	157,645	1,342,725	7,293,365
Bilingual Belt	1,558,285	3,396,520	505,760	5,460,565
Quebec Heartland	39,180	2,159,840	14,520	2,213,540
English Maritimes	1,725,415	58,215	26,690	1,810,320
Total	14,750,490	6,176,240	3,156,790	24,083,520

Source: 1981 Census of Canada, Catalogue 95-942.

The patterns we found for 1971 persist generally in 1981. We see, again, the overrepresentations of the English mother tongue segment in Western Canada, Upper Canada and the English Maritimes, and the French mother tongue segment in the Quebec Heartland and the lowest for the Bilingual Belt. The overall patterns, however, remained virtually stable.

Given these regional concentrations, we can expect that most of the regular contact between members of the English and French language communities will take place in the Bilingual Belt, and that we should expect this region to have the highest proportion in the population to speak both English and French. In the other regions of the country, we should expect the "official language minorities" (English in the Quebec Heartland, French in the other regions) to be bilingual, that is to be able to converse in the regional majority language (note that the French mother tongue population in Abitibi, Saguenay and Nouveau Quebec is, of course, part of the majority). We should expect the regional majorities to have rather low proportions being able to speak the minority languages.

When we developed the regional breakdown described here, we were interested in more detailed analyses of language characteristics of the population. We constructed a typology of individuals, based on their responses to several census questions relating to language: the questions on mother tongue and home language (both of which were discussed earlier in this chapter) as well as a question in which respondents were asked about their ability to speak English and/or French (see de Vries and Vallee, 1980:75-76 for a detailed discussion of the design of the typology). The resulting categories are mutually exclusive and exhaustive. There are three "unilingual" categories: English, French and "other." For the English unilingual, respondents indicated that their mother tongue was English, that English was the language they used most often at home, and that they were able to speak English, but not French. The French unilinguals had comparable mentions of French, the "other" unilinguals reported a mother tongue other than English or French and a home language identical to their mother tongue. They were unable to speak either English or French.

The three "bilingual" categories should be fairly self-evident: the "official" bilinguals mentioned either English or French as mother tongue and as home language and indicated that they were able to speak both English and French. The "unofficial" bilinguals mentioned in their responses, two languages, one of which was either English or French, while the other one was a language other than English or French. Finally, the "multilingual" category contains persons who mentioned three or four different languages in their responses to the three questions. Moreover, this category also contains a (very small) number of people who mentioned two languages, neither of which was English or French.

One of the useful features of this typology is that it tells us a little more about possibilities for language contact. For example, an English unilingual and a French unilingual can only communicate with each other if

they happen to share a language other than English or French, in contrast an officially bilingual person is able to communicate with virtually everyone, except the "unilingual other" group. For 1971, we were able to use a special tabulation which yielded the regional distribution of the seven language categories. The data are given in Table 2.10.

It is indeed the case that large proportions of the English and French language communities will have very little contact with members of the other "charter group." This is especially the case for the English unilinguals in the English Maritimes, Upper Canada and Western Canada (where they contain 92.9, 76.9 and 75.4 percent of the total population, respectively, while the percentages of French unilinguals in these regions are 0.4, 0.2 and 0.2) and for the French unilinguals in the Quebec Heartland, where they represent 84 percent of the population (and where English unilinguals only make up 0.6 percent of the population). Contact between the English and the French language communities was postulated to be most likely in the Bilingual Belt. This is, indeed, where we find over half of the officially bilingual population of Canada, as well as of the multilinguals (most of whom are people of "other" mother tongue, able to speak both English and French). For the Bilingual Belt, the proportion officially bilingual is 31.3 percent, but note that even in this region there are 23.4 percent unilingual English and 36.2 percent unilingual French. Given the high degree of similarity between the data for 1971 and 1981 in Tables 2.8 and 2.9, it is reasonable to assume that the patterns shown in Table 2.10 for 1971 also persisted through 1981.

The joint use of data from Tables 2.8 and 2.10 sheds further light on the tendencies for members of regional linguistic minorities to acquire a good knowledge of the regional majority language. The census data indicate, indeed, that only a small proportion of such minorities is unable to use the appropriate majority language. We already noted the very small proportions of unilingual French in the English Maritimes, Upper Canada and Western Canada, and the comparably small proportion of English unilinguals in the Quebec Heartland. Similarly, the proportions of the members of other language communities who have not (yet) acquired the ability to use a majority language are relatively small. If we combine the relevant data from Tables 2.8 and 2.10, we find proportions of 22.4, 5.7, 13.4, 14.3, 10.6, and 5.7 percent for the regions respectively (ordered in the same fashion as in Tables 2.8 and 2.10, i.e., Northern Canada first, English Maritimes last). The relatively high proportion of unilinguals in Northern Canada consists to a large degree of Native people, who tend to live in relative isolation from the rest of Canadian society. The lowest proportions (for Western Canada and the English Maritimes) characterize regions in which relatively few recent immigrants have settled (in contrast to Upper Canada and the Bilingual Belt, which contain the Metropolitan Areas of Toronto and Montreal, respectively). To sum up: regional minorities, both official and unofficial ones, have generally acquired the language of the regional majority (French in the Quebec Heartland, English elsewhere). While this statement does not indicate much about actual language use, it does tell us that such minorities are the least capable of interacting with members of the majority language community.

TABLE 2.10: Selected Language Characteristics of the Population by Region, Canada, 1971

	Northern Canada	Western Canada	Upper Canada	Bilingual Belt	Quebec Heartland	English Maritimes
Unilingual Other	34,935	59,265	151,600	64,645	1,095	1,360
Unilingual English	316,785	4,056,125	5,005,115	1,223,485	11,735	1,564,150
Unilingual French	163,770	8,895	10,185	1,891,095	1,737,665	6,230
Officially Bilingual	69,050	254,085	320,860	1,633,580	305,485	87,450
Multilingual	5,115	43,485	86,125	144,035	4,155	1,925
Unofficially Bilingual-English	114,850	953,835	935,300	217,080	1,340	21,990
Unofficially Bilingual-French	3,975	905	3,650	47,110	4,720	60
Total	708,940	5,376,595	6,512,835	5,218,745	2,068,500	1,068,140

Source: 1971 Census of Canada, unpublished data.

Obviously, the long-term survival of a minority language community depends on the degree to which its members can, and do, use their mother tongue in a variety of domains. Only in the Bilingual Belt can it be argued that both English and French are viable regional language communities.

Consider, finally, the distribution of the official bilinguals over the six linguistic regions. As I already mentioned, well over half of this category is concentrated in the Bilingual Belt, which contained only 30 percent of the population of Canada in 1971. Such a disproportionate concentration of official bilinguals might explain why the official language policies of the federal government during the 1970's have been received with little enthusiasm and fairly high resentment, if not outright opposition, by large segments of the population not living in the Bilingual Belt. This is not to say that the population in the Bilingual Belt has been wildly enthusiastic about such policies, but there is probably more of an appreciation for the problems of English-French communication in this region than one would find elsewhere in the country.

I remarked before that the data in Table 2.10 do not tell us anything about language use. On the basis of unpublished data from the 1971 census, Driedger, Vallee and de Vries put together a regional breakdown of home language use by mother tongue. See Table 2.11.

As we can see, the English language community appears to be quite strong in each of the regions, with the partial exception of the Quebec Heartland. In this region, almost 30 percent of the English language community uses French most often in the home. As we shall see in a later chapter, for this region English is not used on many occasions in the more public domains. While I commented that the Bilingual Belt is the only region in which large, and viable, English and French language communities are in regular contact (and hence the high prevalence of official bilingualism in this region), this contact appears not to have resulted in great amounts of language shift: only 2.8 percent of the English mother tongue community uses French most often in the home, while only 4 percent of the French mother tongue community uses English most often in the home.

In marked contrast to English, the French language community appears to be strong only in the Quebec Heartland, the Bilingual Belt and Northern Canada, where relatively little shift to English home language use has occurred. In the rest of the country, it is questionable whether the French language community will survive more than about a generation. In Western Canada and in Upper Canda, well over half of the French mother tongue population uses English most often in the home. Obviously, those members of these language communities who are employed outside the home will use English almost exclusively at work. Children will receive much of their formal education in English and will often use the language with their friends. Given relatively high tendencies for members of these regional minorities to marry outside their language community, it is highly probable that the children in these French language minorities will not raise <u>their</u> children in

TABLE 2.11: Percentage Distribution of Home Language Use by Mother Tongue and Region, Canada, 1971

Mother Tongue:	English			French			Other		
Home Language:	English	French	Other	English	French	Other	English	French	Other
Region:									
Northern Canada	98.6	0.6	0.8	5.7	94.1	0.2	34.9	0.7	64.4
Western Canada	99.3	0.1	0.6	53.6	46.1	0.3	61.3	0.1	38.6
Upper Canada	99.1	0.1	0.8	56.6	42.5	0.9	39.8	0.2	60.0
Bilingual Belt	96.3	2.8	0.9	4.0	95.8	0.2	26.1	6.9	67.0
Quebec Heartland	70.9	28.7	0.4	0.5	99.4	0.1	16.4	39.5	44.1
English Maritimes	99.8	0.1	0.1	39.6	60.3	0.1	59.2	0.4	40.4

Source: 1971 Census of Canada, unpublished data.

French. It is likely that very strong legal protection and the provision of a wide array of services (in particular, public education at least through the secondary level) will be required to increase the chances of survival for these regional minorities. Even with such strong support, minority survival is by no means guaranteed.

The attraction of English on the regional language minorities outside Quebec is evident not only with regards to the French peripheral minorities, but also with regards to those of "other" mother tongues. English obviously has a stronger attraction than French in all regions except the Quebec Heartland. Even in the Bilingual Belt, where we found viable language communities for the French as well as for the English, more of those of other mother tongue use English in the home than use French (the ratio is roughly four to one). For these "other" language communities, finally, the contrast between early and recent immigration becomes evident: in the areas of early immigration (Western Canada and the English Maritimes), over half of the population with "other" mother tongues is using English most often at home. In the areas of recent immigration (Upper Canada and the Bilingual Belt), more than half are (still) using an "other" language (generally the mother language) most often in the home. Even in these regions, however, language use in the public domains will exert pressures on the minority members to acquire and then use one of the majority languages.

For 1981, the same cross-tabulation could be constructed. The results are given in Table 2.12.

When we consider the 1981 data separately, the same story may be written which applied to the 1971 data. The English language community remained strong in all regions except the Quebec Heartland, where an increasing proportion was using French as home language. The fairly low levels of language shift in the Bilingual Belt remained low, though both percentages increased during the period 1971-1981. The French language communities outside the Quebec Heartland, the Bilingual Belt and the North remained weak; in fact, percentages shifting to English home language increased from 1971 to 1981 in all regions. This increased weakness occurred despite the gains in legal rights and in access to education in their mother tongue during this period. It is, at this time, impossible to assess the effects of developments during the 1980'S (following the 1981 census and the granting of minority language rights in the Constitution). Given the persistence of the trends as shown in Tables 2.11 and 2.12 above, it is doubtful whether even the minority rights clauses in the Constitution are adequate means to prevent the decline in the strength of regional language minorities from continuing.

TABLE 2.12: Percentage of Home Language Use by Mother Tongue and Region, Canada, 1981

Mother Tongue:	English			French			Other		
Home Language:	English	French	Other	English	French	Other	English	French	Other
Region:									
Northern Canada	98.1	0.8	1.1	5.6	94.0	0.4	36.3	0.5	63.2
Western Canada	99.2	0.1	0.7	59.0	40.6	0.4	59.5	0.1	40.4
Upper Canada	98.9	0.2	0.9	58.6	40.5	0.9	44.6	0.2	55.2
Bilingual Belt	93.9	5.2	0.9	4.8	94.8	0.4	31.2	8.4	60.4
Quebec Heartland	53.1	46.6	0.3	0.9	99.1	0.0	8.6	33.8	57.6
English Maritimes	99.7	0.2	0.1	42.4	57.5	0.1	58.3	0.4	41.3

Source: 1981 Census of Canada, Catalogue 95-942.

CHAPTER 3: PROCESSES AFFECTING CHANGE

Introduction

In the preceding chapter we have taken a superficial look at the size and spatial distribution of Canada's largest language communities. The information on which that description was based came primarily from two sources: the population censuses of 1971 and 1981. Both of these data sources are, of course, cross-sectional. Where inferences were made, they were either based on inspections of the cross-sectional characteristics (scientifically a somewhat risky undertaking) or on data from Table 2.1 which summarized the fate of ten mother tongue categories for the period 1931-1981.

Several statements were made in that chapter regarding the likely future for some of these language communities. These statements indicated that the long-term survival of the immigrant communities was, to a large degree, a function of future immigration trends. They also suggested that most of the regional language minorities tend to lose members through language shift (and thus decline in size - or at least do not increase as much as they would have without the occurrence of language shift).

If we wish to take a more systematic look at the dynamic aspects of language community survival, we should take a demographic view. For any language group, for which we have measures of size at two points in time, we can state that the difference in size is the combined result of: fertility, mortality, net migration and net language shift. Fertility is the acquisition of new members through birth. If the defining criterion for group membership is mother tongue, the fertility component should be based on the number of infants and very young children who are in the process of acquiring that particular language as mother tongue. Mortality is the loss of members through death. Net migration is the difference between the number of individuals migrating into a territory (with this particular mother tongue) and the number migrating out of the territory. Finally, net language shift is the difference between the number of persons "entering" the language community (through a change in habitual language use) and the number of persons "leaving" the language community. Obviously, the use of the mother tongue criterion makes it very difficult for an individual to undergo language shift. Recall that the current Canadian census definition refers to mother tongue as the language first spoken and still understood. The "language first spoken" can, of course, not change for an individual. The only way in which the Canadian mother tongue criterion allows for language shift to occur is for an individual to cease understanding his mother tongue (that is, the language first spoken).

At least in theory, we should be able to decompose the change in size of the various language communities into the contributions of these four components. Such an analysis would tell us much about the future viability of a group; it would also tell us a lot about the demographic composition of the group and guide us to statements about the particular "needs" of the group (for example, education versus old-age homes.) Unfortunately, the kind of analysis here envisioned is virtually impossible. In the first place, the

required data for this type of decomposition do not exist. Thus, rather than "measuring" a group's fertility, we have to estimate it. The same is true for virtually all of the other demographic processes we are considering. It is only for immigrants that we can obtain reasonably reliable data: published data from Canadian census allow a researcher to separate the foreign-born from those born in Canada; moreover, we can divide the foreign born by period of immigration (those periods are generally mapped on intercensal decades, or components of these decades) and we can obtain the mother tongue composition for any group of intercensal immigrants. Thus, the data in the 1981 census tell us how many persons of Italian mother tongue, who immigrated to Canada in the period 1971-1981, were residing in Canada at the time the 1981 census was taken. Note that I describe this information in a very particular way: this number will not be equal to the number of Italian immigrants during that period. Italian immigrants may fail to be included in the 1981 census for several reasons:

(i) "undercoverage": it is possible for an individual to be missed by the census taker. Generally, the percentage of the population missed by undercoverage is less than 2 percent for advanced industrial societies;

(ii) death (after immigration, but before June 3, 1981);

(iii) emigration (either back to the country of origin or to a different country);

(iv) language shift (see above);

(v) "errors" in the processing of the census data (such as forms getting lost in transit, specific variables coded or key-punched incorrectly).

The second major reason for the decomposition of change to be difficult, if not impossible, follows from the first one. Remember that I commented that, in the absence of the required data, we have to resort to estimation procedures. The difficulty with such techniques is that they are frequently based on a number of untestable hypotheses. The empirical tenability of these hypotheses has a bearing on the value of the estimate which we eventually obtain. For example, one technique for estimating intercensal language shift is based on the assumption that two language groups have identical age-specific mortality rates (de Vries, 1974, 1977). In the absence of independent evidence for this hypothesis, the resulting estimates are a function of the degree to which differential mortality exists. The larger the difference in age-specific mortality between the two groups, the larger the error in the resulting estimate of net language shift.

Despite all of the above reservations, Canadian researchers have made several attempts at estimating the relative effects of these demographic processes on the growth of language communities. The most recent and, at the

same time, most systematic effort was by Lachapelle and Henripin (1982, chapters 3-6); on which the remainder of this chapter is based.

Fertility

The estimation of the effects of fertility on the growth of Canadian language communities has a fairly long history, despite the already noted absence of the required data. It is a well known fact that high levels of fertility were the main cause of the extremely rapid growth of the French speaking population of Lower Canada prior to Confederation. The analyses by Keyfitz suggest that the number of immigrants to New France probably did not exceed 10,000 persons. Yet, the population of New France had increased to about 70,000 in 1763 and to 890,000 in 1851 (Keyfitz, 1960: 129). Such estimates led Keyfitz to suggest that the fertility levels which produced such rapid growth must have been "... among the highest ever reached, even among small populations occupying practically limitless areas ..." (1960:130). Continuing high levels of fertility for the French language community in Canada were instrumental in explaining the rapid growth rates through 1951 (Lieberson, 1970:51).

When researchers attempt to estimate more precisely the differences in fertility between the various language communities, their estimations tend to be based on demographic data by ethnic origin or by mother tongue. The earlier studies generally use ethnic origin, while more recent ones are more likely to be based on mother tongue. While the use of ethnic origin (defined in terms of paternal ancestry and divided into categories which could be linked to language) was probably accurate enough before the second World War (i.e., through the census of 1941), it has been shown that more recent data on ethnic origin are not very reliable indicators of an individual's language characteristics (Ryder, 1955; de Vries and Vallee, 1975; Castonguay, 1977; Lachapelle and Henripin, 1982:25-26).

If we concentrate on estimates of fertility based on mother tongue, we are faced with a problem. Normally, measures of fertility are derived from the linkage between the number of babies born and the number of persons (or women, or women in the child-bearing ages) who share a particular characteristic. We can, for example, calculate crude birth rates (number of births per 1,000 population) for countries, provinces, regions and so on. We can also calculate such things as age-specific birth rates (babies born to mothers in a particular age group, per 1,000 women in that age group). When we apply this logic to the study of "linguistic fertility," two problems arise. First of all, babies are not "born with" a language, but acquire it some time after their birth. This may sound picayune, but, at least in theory, can not be entirely ignored. In societies where groups differ radically with regards to infant mortality, the proportions of live-born babies which reach age two may vary quite a bit between different groups. This example is not as far-fetched as you may think: for the total Canadian population, infant mortality rates (that is, the number of infant deaths per

1,000 live births) ranged from about 28 in 1960 to about 19 in 1972. During that same period, infant mortality among the Inuit of the Northwest Territories ranged from a high of over 200 to a low of about 75. Such differences are bound to have an impact on any comparison between mother tongue groups (Perspective Canada, 1974, chart 12-13).

However, the second problem is even more confounding: infants and their mothers do not need to belong to the same language community if we define membership in terms of mother tongue. For example, a mother who belongs to one of the regional official language minorities (say a woman of French mother tongue in Ontario) may have shifted to the use of English at home. The probability is quite high that her children will grow up with English as the "language first learned in childhood" and will therefore belong to the English language community. The effects of this discrepancy will obviously be largest in those regions where large proportions of a language minority adopt a majority language as the language spoken most often in the home. That these tendendences are not trivially small is shown in Table 3.1.

TABLE 3.1: Percentage of Women Aged 15-39 Using Majority Language[1] Most Often at Home, by Mother Tongue and Region, Canada, 1971 and 1981

	Mother Tongue					
	English		French		Other	
Region	1971	1981	1971	1981	1971	1981
Atlantic	-	-	15.9	15.0	52.7	53.0
Quebec	6.9	11.7	-	-	9.0	10.2
Ontario	-	-	34.9	36.6	44.8	47.4
Prairies	-	-	54.1	59.4	65.2	58.4
British Columbia	-	-	74.1	69.6	59.6	54.4
Northern Territories	-	-	62.9	62.2	34.1	34.4

Note 1: French in Quebec, English Elsewhere

Sources: 1971 Census of Canada, unpublished tables.
1981 Census of Canada, Volume 1, Table 3.

Observe that these percentages pertain only to women between the ages of 15 and 39 (the main childbearing ages), regardless of marital status. Given the high rates of intermarriage for the linguistic minorities, comparable proportions may be higher for the married population.

With this in mind, we may consider the data on fertility, as sumarized in Table 3.2.

The bases for Table 3.1 and 3.2 are, incidentally, not the same: in Table 3.1 we deal with all women aged 15-39, regardless of marital status,

while in Table 3.2 we restrict ourselves to ever-married women (those now married, widowed, divorced or separated) between the ages of 15 and 44. It is not likely that these differences have a large effect on this analysis.

TABLE 3.2: Children Born to Ever-Married Women Aged 15-44, by Mother Tongue and Region, Canada, 1971 and 1981

	Total		English		French		Other	
	1971	1981	1971	1981	1971	1981	1971	1981
Atlantic	2,812	2,109	2,772	2,113	3,104	2,057	2,693	2,328
Quebec	2,306	1,679	2,098	1,649	2,368	1,663	1,981	1,939
Ontario	2,175	1,765	2,155	1,709	2,606	1,902	2,095	1,942
Prairies	2,414	1,848	2,263	1,758	2,954	2,025	2,783	2,263
British Columbia plus Territories	2,178	1,717	2,124	1,654	2,498	1,769	2,376	2,106

Sources: 1971 Census of Population, Bulletin 1.5-11, Table 33.
1981 Census of Population, Catalogue 92-906, Table 4.

Table 3.2 shows that in each region of the country (note, by the way, that the regions to which this table refers are groups of provinces, rather than the groups of counties and census divisions used in chapter 2), the number of children born to ever-married women between the ages of 15 and 44 of French mother tongue was higher than the comparable number for women of English mother tongue. The only exception is formed by the Atlantic provinces in 1981, where the number of children per 1,000 women of French mother tongue fell to a little below that for women of English mother tongue. These differences were most pronounced in 1971 in the Prairie provinces, where the average for women of French mother tongue exceeded that for English mother tongue women by almost 0.7 child. Fertility declined for all groups between 1971 and 1981, more heavily for women of French mother tongue than for the other groups. As a consequence, the excess fertility of the French mother tongue women, compared with that of women of English mother tongue, declined considerably during the intercensal decade. The drop in fertility was smallest for the women of other mother tongues. As a consequence, their values exceeded those of the English mother tongue women in 1981, while in 1971 only the values for the Western provinces were larger than those for their English mother tongue counterparts.

Combined inspection of the data in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 gives us some clues about the effects of fertility on the survival of regional language communities in Canada. Without the operation of the other demographic processes (and under the assumption that the differences noted for 1971 and 1981 would persist after that time), the number of children born to women of French mother tongue would be larger than we would expect on the basis of the population figures. As such, the Francophone populations would, in each regions, either maintain their share of the population or increase it slightly. As Lachapelle and Henripin remark, the overall Canadian fertility

of Francophone women is lower than that for the other mother tongue groups, because the Francophones are concentrated in Quebec, which since the late 1960s has had birth rates below those for the rest of the country (1982:97 ff).

If, however, we put together the data on fertility in Table 3.2 with the data on language shift for regional minorities from Table 3.1, the picture changes considerably. Consider, for example, the data for Ontario in 1971. Table 3.2 suggests that French mother tongue women (ever married, and between the ages of 15 and 44) had an average of 2.606 children per woman. The data in Table 3.1 would suggest that almost 35 percent of these women would have shifted to English home language (recall the slight discrepancy in the groups compared). Thus, for every 1,000 women of French mother tongue (and "their" 2,606 children), 35 percent may be estimated to have shifted to English. It is fair to assume that 35 percent of these children would have English as mother tongue (this proportion might in fact be higher, if we assume that married women have somewhat higher propensities to shift than would single women in those same ages). As a consequence, the 1,000 women would only have 2606 × 0.651, or 1,697 children of French mother tongue. You may realize that, given the ratio in sizes between the English mother tongue group and the French mother tongue group, the resulting "increase" for the English group is negligible.

The same type of reasoning for 1981 yields an even more startling conclusion. Taking Ontario again, we find that an hypothetical group of 1,000 French mother tongue women would have 36.6 percent using English as home language. Presumably, their children would have English as mother tongue. Meanwhile, fertility for Franco-Ontarian women dropped to 1.902 children per woman. Thus, the initial group of 1,000 would have only 1,902 × 0.634 = 1,206 children of French mother tongue.

If we combine, at least in a qualitative way, these effects of fertility and of language shift, it is safe to argue that the result is undoubtedly that minorities will diminish, as their children grow up with the majority language as their mother tongue. These combined effects are most pronounced for all "other" mother tongue minorities (the very low figures for Quebec are somewhat misleading, since many others shifted to English home language) and for the French minorities west of Quebec. It is - if we follow the analysis - only the French mother tongue community in the Atlantic provinces (most of which, incidentally is in northern New Brunswick) and the English language community in Quebec which are likely to be only <u>mildly</u> affected by the combined effects of fertility and language shift. Even for the latter one, declining fertility and the increased attraction of French in the province of Quebec, the joint effects of fertility and language shift probably contributed significantly to the intercensal decline.

Mortality

Estimating fertility for language communities may have appeared to be difficult, but estimating mortality turns out to be even harder, close to impossible. We have some estimation techniques by which we translate data on age structure into estimates of fertility. While similar techniques are available for the estimation of mortality in total populations, they do not work in the situation where other processes (migration, language shift) "interfere" with the effects of mortality. That is, a "loss" through mortality cannot be distinguished from a loss through language shift, nor from one due to emigration. Given that we lack adequate techniques for estimating language shift or the effects of migration separately, there is no easy way out of this puzzle. Lachapelle and Henripin made an attempt to estimate the effects of mortality, but they did not achieve very much, either; their chapter on mortality amounts only to nine pages (87-95). This summary is a condensation of their discussion.

In the absence of mortality statistics which allow us to identify deaths by the language characteristics of the individual (the traditional way to calculate specific mortality rates or patterns), the common approximation has been to identify regions which are relatively homogeneous with regards to the characteristic one is studying, and then to take the mortality characteristics for that region as an estimator for the mortality experience of the group. Concretely, this has meant that the mortality experience in Quebec has been used as an estimator of the mortality patterns for the French language community. Differences in mortality between the English and French language communities have been estimated by means of analyzing the mortality data for Ontario and Quebec, respectively. While such a comparison will give us good evidence for the mortality effects on Canada's French language community as a whole, it does not tell us anything about the mortality differences between the French and English language communities within each region. That problem was already illustrated with regards to fertility, where we saw that the fertility of the French was higher than that of the English in every region, but where overall fertility was lower, due to the concentration of the French in Quebec, where the fertility levels were lowest for all language categories.

The few studies which were conducted with regards to mortality generally suggest that mortality is somewhat higher for the French group than for the remainder of the population. As examples: life expectancy at birth was higher for residents of Ontario than for those of Quebec, although the difference has been declining fairly steadily between 1931 and 1976. For 1976, life expectancy at birth was 70.6 years for Ontario males, against 69.1 years for Quebec males. Comparable values for females were 77.7 and 76.5 years (Lachapelle and Henripin, 1982:89).

Within the census metropolitan area of Montreal, a study was conducted in which the mortality of areas with high proportions of francophones was compared with that of areas with low proportions of francophones. For the

areas with high francophone concentration, infant mortality was somewhat higher (16.9 per 1,000, compared to 14.0 per 1,000). Moreover, the overall mortality for the high francophone area was about 5 percent higher than the provincial level (based on indirect standardization), whereas it was about 5 percent lower for the low francophone area (Lachapelle and Henripin, 1982:90). Within, Quebec, similar differences in life expectancy at birth were found between persons of French ethnic origin and the remainder of the Quebec population.

While the estimates reported so far all suggest slightly higher mortality levels for the French community than for the remainder of Canada's population, it can be shown that the estimated level of differences is not likely to have much effect on the total difference in natural increase (that is, the net effects of fertility and mortality). Lachapelle and Henripin estimate, for example, that the fertility level of the population of French ethnic origin in Quebec should exceed that of the rest of the Quebec population by about one percent for the differential impact of mortality to be cancelled out. As they state in their summary: "Nowadays, the effects of differential mortality on the rate of demographic growth have become so slight that it is hardly worth mentioning them." (1982:95)

Migration

Very obviously, language communities can gain new members by means of migration, that is the relatively permanent change in residence of persons who know the pertinent language. It should be just as clear that language communities can also lose members, by the counterpart of the process. When we deal with studies of migration, we must distinguish between two types: international migration and internal migration. The former involves a change of residence from one nation-state to another one. The latter, in contrast, involves a change of residence within the boundaries of one nation-state. Language communities measured at the national level are of course not numerically affected by internal migration. Their spatial distribution (and, as a consequence, the size of regional language communities), on the other hand, may be affected by internal migration.

With regards to international migration, we should consider both the stream of individuals moving into Canada (the immigrants) and that of persons leaving Canada (the emigrants). Unfortunately, very little information is available about emigration from Canada at all, let alone that we would know anything about the linguistic composition of such streams. We know only a little more about the immigrants. Immigration statistics recorded the ethnic origins of immigrants to Canada from 1900 to 1965. From 1966 on, available data only inform us about the ability of the immigrants to speak English or French. Here again, we must rely on data from the population censuses. As I indicated before, the census data for 1971 and 1981 give relatively detailed breakdowns of the population separately for those born in Canada and those born elsewhere. Moreover, the 1976 census provides us with a cross-

tabulation of the population by province of residence in 1976, province of residence in 1971, mother tongue, age group and sex. This particular table allows us to make some statements about the effects of immigration and internal migration during the period 1971-1976 on the various language communities. A comparable table is available for 1981. Published tables only divide the population into mother tongue categories of English, French and other, but this should give us enough for at least a basic outline of the effects of migration.

If we consider the international migrants first, we can put together the information in Tables 3.3 and 3.4.

The total number of persons concerned in 1976 was about 720,000, while in 1981 roughly 556,000 people were involved. These numbers are lower than the "real" number of persons who immigrated to Canada during these two five-year periods: not only should we consider the factors of underenumeration, of emigration and of deaths among recent immigrants, but in addition there will be some children less than five years of age in the pertinent census, who immigrated to Canada with their parents.

With these reservations in mind, let us look at Table 3.3. We see that, of the remaining immigrants in 1976, almost 400,000 reported English as mother tongue, or almost 55 percent. While this proportion is slightly lower than that for the total Canadian population, the underrepresentation is not as severe as it is for the French mother tongue community: only about 52,000 immigrants, or about 7 percent, had French as mother tongue. Virtually all of the remainder, or about 35 percent, had a mother tongue other than English or French, while the immigrants for whom mother tongue was not stated made up the final 3 percent.

Table 3.4 tells a comparable story. Overall immigration declined somewhat in 1976-1981 from that for 1971-1976, with the decline affecting primarily those of English mother tongue. In this second period, only 45 percent of the immigrants had English as mother tongue. The French mother tongue share of the immigrants remained at 7 percent, while the proportion with other mother tongues rose to almost half for 1976-1981.

Given the fact that the great majority of those of other mother tongues is likely to acquire, and subsequently use, English rather than French, the effect of international migration appears to be that "other" language communities will be supported for an unknown number of years after the initial settlement of the immigrants, while the English language community is likely to benefit in the long run. The French language community it not likely to gain very much from international migration during the period 1971-1981. This latter statement is reinforced if we consider, again, that the above numbers only reflect the results of immigration. Lachapelle and Henripin tried to estimate the magnitude and language composition of the emigration stream for the same period. The two hypotheses they entertained suggest that the net gain for 1971-1976, through international migration, to the French

TABLE 3.3: Province of Residence in 1976 for Individuals Residing Outside Canada in 1971, by Mother Tongue

	Mother Tongue							
	English		French		Other		Not Stated	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Newfoundland	3,280	0.8	60	0.1	655	0.3	185	0.8
Prince Edward Island	1,545	0.4	45	0.1	95	0.0	15	0.1
Nova Scotia	10,315	2.6	570	1.1	1,470	0.6	175	0.8
New Brunswick	7,700	2.0	4,355	8.4	910	0.4	245	1.1
Quebec	32,680	8.3	38,325	73.8	33,510	13.3	3,690	16.4
Ontario	206,045	52.5	5,835	11.2	139,955	55.4	11,775	52.4
Manitoba	15,840	4.0	505	1.0	11,130	4.4	790	3.5
Saskatchewan	6,595	1.7	150	0.3	2,805	1.1	340	1.5
Alberta	39,415	10.0	850	1.6	19,740	7.8	1,895	8.4
British Columbia	68,130	17.4	1,185	2.3	42,070	16.7	3,280	14.6
Yukon	525	0.1	20	0.0	115	0.0	25	0.1
Northwest Territories	580	0.1	25	0.0	185	0.1	40	0.2
Total	392,655	99.9	51,925	99.9	252,640	100.1	22,455	99.9

Source: 1976 Census of Population, Bulletin 85D.3, Table 1.

TABLE 3.4: Province of Residence in 1981 for Individuals Residing Outside Canada in 1976, by Mother Tongue

	Mother Tongue							
	English		French		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Newfoundland	1,995	0.8	40	0.1	525	0.2	2,565	0.5
Prince Edward Island	950	0.4	20	0.1	260	0.1	1,230	0.2
Nova Scotia	6,475	2.6	370	0.9	1,565	0.6	8,400	1.5
New Brunswick	4,675	1.9	1,635	4.1	1,090	0.4	7,400	1.3
Quebec	15,435	6.1	30,065	76.1	39,200	14.8	84,695	15.2
Ontario	121,915	48.5	4,175	10.6	119,175	44.9	245,265	44.1
Manitoba	9,885	3.9	575	1.5	13,945	5.3	24,410	4.4
Saskatchewan	5,430	2.2	125	0.3	5,725	2.2	11,280	2.0
Alberta	38,765	15.4	1,240	3.1	35,475	13.4	75,485	13.6
British Columbia	44,945	17.9	1,225	3.1	48,270	18.2	94,450	17.0
Yukon	300	0.1	0	0.0	140	0.1	445	0.1
Northwest Territories	395	0.2	15	0.0	175	0.1	580	0.1
Total	251,165	100.0	39,490	100.0	265,545	100.0	556,195	100.0

Source: 1981 Census of Cananda, Catalogue 92-907, Table 9.

language community in all of Canada would be between 17,000 and 19,000 individuals (i.e., about 0.3 percent). In contrast, gains for the English language community would range between 196,000 and 249,000 and for the other language communities combined between 214,000 and 235,000. Thus, the percentage gains for these two categories would be roughly 1.5 percent for the English and 7 percent for the "other" language communities combined (see Lachapelle and Henripin, 1982:188 and 190 for the data).

Not only was net international migration for 1971-1981 likely to be disadvantageous for the French mother tongue community in Canada, it was also disadvantageous to Quebec's share of Canada's population. With the exception of the immigrants of French mother tongue, about half of these immigrants settled in Ontario. Even for the French mother tongue immigrants, Quebec's share was only about three-quarters, slightly less than the percentage of Canada's francophones living in Quebec. More detailed estimates by Lachapelle and Henripin suggest that, for international migration to Quebec, the effect was to strengthen (relatively speaking) the 'other' mother tongue communities in the province. The differential effect on the English and French language communities in the province is difficult to estimate: depending on one's choice of assumptions, either the English group was strengthened in comparison to the French, or it was weakened (1982:193, Table 6.6).

With regards to internal migration, we have data from the population censuses of 1976 and 1981; in addition, we can provide some estimates for the period 1976-1982 on the basis of a large sample survey conducted by Statistics Canada in August 1982 (Current Population Profile 0882). The two censuses provide us with data on the mother tongue of those persons who, during the preceding five years, migrated to another province (that is, for 1971-1976 in the 1976 census and for 1976-1981 in the 1981 census). Recall that, once more, children born during the pertinent five-year period are not included in the figures. Moreover, the factors already mentioned in the context of international migration play a role have too: underenumeration, death, and return migration (to the province of origin). With this in mind, consider Tables 3.5 and 3.6.

For the period 1971-1976, the net effects of in internal migration on the English language community were: a slight decline in Newfoundland, slight increases in the other Atlantic provinces, a fairly large decline in Quebec, a general westward shift for the provinces west of Quebec (with Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan losing, Alberta and British Columbia showing net gains). As we saw in Table 3.3, the losses to the English language community in Quebec were not completely offset by gains due to the effects of international migration (about 33,000 immigrants). Although there are no data on emigrants, the total loss to the English community due to migration to and from Quebec was estimated by Lachapelle and Henripin to lie somewhere between 40,000 and 53,000 (1982:188-190). Given the size of the English language community in Quebec during this period (see Table 2.3), this amounts to a net loss of between 5 and 7 percent.

TABLE 3.5: Effects of Internal Migration on Language Communities by Province, Canada, 1976

	English			French			Other		
	In	Out	Net	In	Out	Net	In	Out	Net
Newfoundland	18,800	24,865	-6,065	715	1,270	-555	360	520	-160
Prince Edward Island	10,785	8,450	2,335	555	520	35	170	140	30
Nova Scotia	51,045	46,395	4,650	3,040	2,660	380	1,325	1,100	225
New Brunswick	35,415	29,395	6,020	10,325	7,235	3,090	820	770	50
Quebec	39,515	89,595	-50,080	35,225	39,105	-3,880	4,320	9,775	-5,445
Ontario	159,540	205,295	-45,755	28,965	33,580	-4,615	13,950	15,690	-1,740
Manitoba	48,070	71,220	-23,150	3,050	3,850	-800	5,590	8,125	-2,535
Saskatchewan	45,600	72,470	-26,870	1,915	2,305	-390	4,685	7,460	-2,775
Alberta	155,295	98,450	56,845	6,225	3,340	2,885	12,460	10,590	1,870
British Columbia	169,545	88,665	80,880	7,750	3,890	3,860	18,660	8,045	10,615
Yukon	5,805	5,320	485	195	225	-30	280	345	-65
Northwest Territories	7,700	6,995	705	490	470	20	655	715	-60

Source: 1976 Census of Canada, Bulletin 850.3, Table 3.

TABLE 3.6: Effects of Internal Migration on Language Communities by Province, Canada, 1981

	English			French			Other		
	In	Out	Net	In	Out	Net	In	Out	Net
Newfoundland	17,635	36,280	-18,645	520	1,175	-655	280	815	-535
Prince Edward Island	9,230	9,395	-165	555	435	120	155	120	35
Nova Scotia	49,420	57,905	-8,485	3,575	3,065	510	1,460	1,910	-450
New Brunswick	31,150	38,920	-7,770	9,380	9,965	-585	930	1,080	-150
Quebec	25,220	131,530	-106,310	31,880	49,940	-18,060	4,215	21,565	-17,350
Ontario	195,320	266,655	-71,335	31,910	33,940	-2,030	23,345	28,045	-4,700
Manitoba	45,490	81,495	-36,005	3,150	3,985	-835	5,390	12,140	-6,570
Saskatchewan	54,755	61,095	-6,340	2,780	1,850	930	5,855	6,275	-420
Alberta	286,755	121,245	165,510	19,655	4,535	15,120	30,415	13,400	17,015
British Columbia	198,650	107,045	91,605	10,330	4,820	5,510	25,570	11,755	13,815
Yukon	6,000	6,370	-370	255	265	-10	415	590	-175
Northwest Territories	7,530	9,225	-1,695	540	560	-20	815	1,160	-345

Source: 1981 Census of Canada, Catalogue 92-907, Table 9.

For the French mother tongue community, the period 1971-1976 showed a comparable pattern as the one we found for the English: slight gains in the Atlantic provinces (particularly New Brunswick), a slight loss in Quebec and westward shift for the remainder of the country, with gains for Alberta and British Columbia. Especially for the latter province, the net effect of migration may well have been a gain of close to 5,000 individuals (see Tables 3.3 and 3.5), or well over 10 percent of its size in 1976. For Ontario, the net losses through internal migration may well have been offset by the gains from international migration.

For the remaining language communities, of other mother tongues, finally, the general pattern of interprovincial migration streams for 1971-1976 closely resembles those of the English mother tongue groups (slight gains for the Atlantic provinces, losses for Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, gains for Alberta and British Columbia), but their effects are much smaller than those of the international migration. Thus, it is likely that the other language communities in Quebec gained slightly from migration, while the remaining provinces gained proportionately more (with the exception of Saskatchewan, where the net migration balance for those of other mother tongues may well have been negative).

Lachapelle and Henripin have attempted, on the basis of special unpublished tables from the censuses of 1971 and 1976, to assess the effects of migration on more precisely defined linguistic regions. Without going into much detail, let me summarize their findings for the period 1971-1976. The regions with the largest attraction to internal migrants of French mother tongue where those with the lowest concentration of Francophones: the net gain which we noted for New Brunswick, for example, had its largest relative impact in Southern New Brunswick, in which the French mother tongue community is a small minority. Within Quebec, the Outaouais region had the highest attraction for Francophone migrants (again, the region in Quebec with the lowest concentration of persons of French mother tongue); the only other region in Quebec showing a net gain for the French language community was the Montreal region. West of Quebec, the largest attraction was manifested by the western provinces (where we noted that the French language communities were rather small and in the process of shifting to English).

For the English language community, the estimates by Lachapelle and Henripin suggest that the highest propensities to leave were found in the regions in which the French mother tongue community had the highest concentration: the largest proportionate losses to the English language community occurred in the regions identified as "Interior Quebec" and "Peripheral Quebec" (in which their concentration was below three percent in 1976). In the Atlantic provinces, the only region in which the English community lost through internal migration was northern New Brunswick (again, a region with relatively high proportions of Francophones), whereas the region of Ontario sustaining the largest proportional losses to the English language community was the North East (where about 35 percent was of French mother tongue in 1976) (Lachapelle and Henripin, 1982:218-221).

The result of these migrations was generally to strengthen the French language regional communities, at least in relative terms, whereas the corresponding English language communities were, in general, weakened by the process. Given the overall viability of the regional English language communities, however, it is only in the "Interior" and "Peripheral" regions of Quebec where such effects may have translated in increasing pressures on the English minority.

For the period 1976-1981, we can use the internal migration data from the 1981 census, given in Table 3.6. For the English language community, we see a continuation of the westward drift which was already in progress during the preceding five years. The process, in fact, intensified: all the Atlantic provinces had net migration losses; the net loss to the English language community in Quebec more than doubled (compared with 1971-1976), those for Ontario and Manitoba increased. In contrast, the net loss to Saskatchewan declined, while the net gains for Alberta and British Columbia increased.

For the French mother tongue community there is a comparable drift to the two western provinces, also mainly directed to Alberta. In this province, the net internal migration gain was a little over 15,000 persons, or about one-quarter of the 1981 population.

In addition to the data from the 1981 census, we may use data from a large survey carried out by Statistics Canada in August 1982. These data shed further light of the internal migration of Canadians during the period 1976-1982. The estimates produced from the survey are not strictly comparable with the population figures, partly because they are estimates based on a sample of about 150,000 respondents, partly because the data refer to the period ending in August 1982, and partly because persons who in August 1982 had not yet reached their fifteenth birthday were excluded from the sample.

With all these reservations, we may consider Table 3.7.

Note that the percentage of the 1976 population migrating refers to those people who had, during the period 1976-1982, lived in a different Canadian province (for at least one month) than where they were living in 1976. It thus includes persons who returned to their province of origin by August, 1982; it excludes people who left the country after June 1, 1976. It also excludes people who died after having moved and before August 1982 (but so do the census data). Keeping all these caveats in mind, we see that, generally, those of English mother tongue were more likely to be interprovincial migrants than were those of French mother tongue. In particular the English from Quebec were prone to leave the province in which they resided in June 1976 - Table 3.7 suggests that roughly one in five English Quebeckers left, during this period, for other provinces. In addition, of course, an unknown number may have left the country altogether. Further analyses in de Vries, 1984, show that the propensity to migrate was only 8.2 percent for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the English in the remaining provinces. In contrast to this, only 2.9 percent of Quebec's French mother tongue population left the province, while 10.2 percent of the French speakers from the other provinces became internal migrants.

TABLE 3.7: Characteristics of Internal Migration by Province and Mother Tongue, 1976-1982

Province	Percentage of 1976 Population Migrating		Percentage of Inter-provincial Migrants Returning	
	English	French	English	French
Newfoundland	10.2	-	38.2	-
Prince Edward Island	13.1*	-	-	-
Nova Scotia	10.9	-	34.1*	-
New Brunswick	10.8*	-	-	-
Quebec	20.4	2.9	-	62.8
Ontario	6.3	9.7*	34.3	-
Manitoba	12.5	-	26.3	-
Saskatchewan	11.4	-	28.5	-
Alberta	11.7	-	22.0*	-
British Columbia	7.1	-	33.9	-
Total	8.9	4.1	29.7	46.7

Notes: -: Estimated value may not be released (too unreliable).
*: Estimated value has a coefficient of variation between 16.5% and 25.0% (interpret with caution).

Source: de Vries, 1984: Table 6.

Table 3.7 further suggests that French mother tongue migrants from Quebec were very likely to return to Quebec by August 1982. Almost two-thirds of these migrants had resettled in Quebec by that time. De Vries (1984) provides the following ordering of these data:

	% Migrating	% Returning
Minority English	20.4	-
French	10.2	22.0
Majority English	8.2	31.3
French	2.9	62.8

In other words, we seem to have two effects: an "English" effect and a "minority effect." The former shows that, ceteris paribus, those of English mother tongue are more likely to be internal migrants than those of French

mother tongue and less likely to return to their province of origin (the percentage of the minority English migrants returning is below 20). The latter effect states that members of regional minorities are more likely to migrate and that minority migrants are less likely to return to their province of origin. Finally, it appears that there is an "interaction effect": members of the English mother tongue minority in Quebec are especially likely to migrate (that is, more than would be expected only on the basis of the "English" effect and the 'minority effect'). With regards to return migration, it appears that particularly the French majority migrants are more prone to return to their province of origin than would be expected on the basis of the two effects.

In some contrast to the findings of Lachapelle and Henripin, the data for 1976-1981 show that the decline of Quebec's English mother tongue community took place primarily in the "contact regions," that is those regions within Quebec where the English had a relatively strong concentration. Consider Table 3.8.

While these data, of course, do not provide any direct information about migration, we can see that the greatest losses occurred in the "contact regions," and there primarily in the core of the Montreal region. In this part of the province, the net decline amounted to over 69,000 persons, or about 14 percent of the initial population. It is hardly possible that such declines could have been the result of natural "increase" (that is, deaths exceeding births); consequently, it is fair to assume that the major factor in this change was net out-migration, presumably to other provinces (since no other region in the province showed any comparable increases in English mother tongue population).

TABLE 3.8: Distribution of Quebec's English Mother Tongue by Region, 1971, 1976 and 1981

	1971	1976	1981
Total Province	789,185	796,665	706,115
Contact Regions	713,695	729,120	639,990
Outaouais	40,830	46,080	42,195
Montreal Region	625,885	637,240	553,620
Iles de Montreal et Jesus	494,950	490,930	421,795
Periphery	130,935	146,800	131,825
Eastern Townships	46,980	45,800	44,175
Remainder of Province	75,505	67,545	66,125
Interior	35,190	31,090	34,825
Gaspesia	15,240	15,155	14,030
North	25,075	21,300	17,270

Sources: Lachapelle and Henripin, 1980:354-355.
1981 Census of Canada, Volume 3, Profile Series A, Table 1.

The second half of the seventies, then, showed a continued westward "drift" of the population, which affected the English language communities as well as the French language communities. For the latter, the most pronounced effect was the relatively large increase in Alberta's French language minority. For the former, the major impact was that Quebec's English mother tongue population began to diminish. In the first half of the intercensal decade, this process affected primarily the English regional minorities in those parts of Quebec where they were weakly concentrated; in the second half, the core of the Montreal area was proportionately most strongly affected, whereas the impact on most other regions appeared to be considerably less.

Language shift

The final demographic "process," language shift, can in theory be analyzed or estimated in various ways. Using a demographic approach, we can apply a "balancing equation" of the form: $P_2 - P_1$ = (natural increase) + (net migration) + (net language shift).

If we were able to measure the difference in size for a language community (i.e., the left-hand side of the equation), as well as the effects of natural increase and net migration, we could estimate the effect of net language shift by the algebraic solution of the equation. In such an approach, "language shift" would equal the "residual" required to balance the equation. Given our difficulties in producing independent estimates of natural increase and net migration effects on changes in the size of language communities in Canada, this approach is not going to be terribly helpful. Note, however, that I did use the approach in a vague form when I commented on the fact that language shift could more than offset the effects of natural increase and migration on the fate of the English language community in Quebec in 1971-1976.

The other approach to the analysis (or, rather estimation) of language shift in Canada is to estimate the proportion of individuals of a given mother tongue who did shift to the habitual use of another language. The obvious difficulty we encounter with this approach is that it does require the determination of an individual's current language use. As we saw, the 1971 and 1981 censuses contain an approximation to this in the question on "home language." While this measure does not enable us to indicate with certainty which language an individual is using "habitually," it is probably not a bad approximation. Recall that the home is the most "private" of the domains, in which individuals are generally <u>least</u> likely to change their language behaviour. As such, an estimate of language shift derived from the cross-tabulation of mother tongue and home language is probably an underestimate of language shift for most linguistic minorities. (Note that this assumption is itself based on the notion that it is unlikely for an individual to forget his mother tongue).

Given that the question on home language was not asked in Canadian censuses prior to 1971, earlier estimates of language shift were based on comparisons between a person's mother tongue and his ethnic origin. It can be shown, without great difficulty, that such an approach can at best provide estimates of language shift among a respondent's ancestors; for that reason, Vallee and I called this phenomenon "ancestral shift" (de Vries and Vallee, 1980:101). While several researchers went beyond this fairly simplistic comparison between ethnic origin and mother tongue to estimate "current" language shift, such estimates become very complicated and the results have unknown error variances. As the comparison between the analyses by Gryz (1977) and Lieberson (1970) shows, such results are possibly to a large degree a function of basic (and untestable) assumptions.

Given the above qualifications, you should not be surprised by the fact that the following discussion about language shift is based largely on the relation between mother tongue and home language, as measured in the 1971 and 1981 censuses of population.

For some of what follows, we can base our descriptions on a direct cross-tabulation of mother tongue and home language, which allows us to make statements about the proportion of a given group shifting to a different language. Such a procedure also enables us to make statements about the "propensities" of members of different groups to shift. Other analyses are based on the relative sizes of the number of persons using a particular language most often at home and the number of individuals reporting that language as mother tongue. This latter approach does not require such finely specified cross-tabulations; it also does not enable us to state anything about individual propensities. It does allow us to say something about "net language shift" (though not about specific directions of such shift). Thus, if the ratio, for a given region, between persons of English home language and of English mother tongue is 1.13, we can state that the English mother tongue community had a "net gain" of 13 percent through language shift; we can <u>not</u> say anything about the probability of someone belonging to another mother tongue community shifting to English home language.

Using the direct cross-classification of mother tongue and home language, we obtain the data in Table 3.9 and Table 3.10.

TABLE 3.9: Percentage Distribution of Home Language by Mother Tongue for Selected Mother Tongue Categories, Canada, 1971

	Home Language			
Mother Tongue	English	French	Mother Tongue	Other
English	98.8	0.5	----(1)	0.7
French	6.0	93.8	----(1)	0.2
Italian	21.9	3.5	74.2	0.4
German	63.1	0.8	35.2	0.9
Ukrainian	57.0	0.2	42.0	0.8
Chinese	24.2	0.4	73.8	1.6
Japanese	47.2	0.2	50.7	2.0
Native Indian	29.9	0.3	69.3	0.5
Inuktitut	8.7	0.1	90.6	0.6
Portuguese	15.8	2.1	79.9	2.1
Dutch	76.9	0.4	21.3	1.3
Flemish	70.9	4.8	19.0	5.3
Polish	50.6	1.0	43.8	4.5

Note 1: Cases in the cells are contained in "English" and "French" respectively.

Source: 1971 Census of Canada, Bulletin SP.6, Table 1.

The data in these tables indicate the strong attraction of English upon persons of all other mother tongues, including French. Recall that the percentages in Table 3.9 and 3.10 indicate observed proportions of various groups shifting to English or French home language. The proportions, for each group, shifting to English home language are in all cases considerably larger than the corresponding proportions shifting to French home language.

Even in the comparison between the two charter groups, the drawing power of English is manifest: over six percent of those of French mother tongue reported that they were using English most often at home, in contrast to less than one percent of the English mother tongue respondents reporting that they used French most often in the home.

At this stage, you may wish to reconsider some of the comments about segregation between mother tongue groups, made in chapter 2. I suggested that the very high segregation between the French mother tongue community and the "other" mother tongues, as shown in Table 2.6, would indicate little language contact and very low proportions able to speak French. While it is clear that Tables 3.9 and 3.10 give us proportions shifting, the postulated patterns clearly hold. On the basis of the same data which produced these tables, we can also calculate the values in Table 3.11. These show us that, indeed, only small proportions of most groups are able to speak French.

TABLE 3.10: Percentage Distribution of Home Language by Mother Tongue for Selected Mother Tongue Categories, Canada, 1981

	Home Language			
Mother Tongue	English	French	Mother Tongue	Other
English	98.4	0.8	----(1)	0.8
French	6.7	93.1	----(1)	0.2
Italian	33.0	3.1	63.7	0.3
German	69.1	0.7	29.6	0.6
Ukrainian	67.9	0.4	31.0	0.7
Chinese	21.6	0.2	76.9	1.4
Japanese	49.1	0.3	49.9	0.8
Native Indian	30.6	0.4	68.3	0.7
Inuktitut	10.5	0.1	89.4	0.1
Portuguese	22.6	2.3	74.5	0.6
Dutch	83.1	0.7	15.3	0.9
Flemish	73.2	8.7	17.4	0.7
Polish	55.7	1.2	40.4	2.8

Note 1: Cases in these cells are contained in "English" and "French" respectively.

Source: 1981 Census of Canada, Volume 1, Table 1.

TABLE 3.11: Percentage able to Speak English, French, or Both, for Selected Mother Tongue Categories, Canada, 1971 and 1981

	English		French		Both	
Mother Tongue	1971	1981	1971	1981	1971	1981
English	100.0	99.9	5.5	6.8	5.5	6.7
French	34.0	37.0	100.0	99.3	34.0	36.2
Italian	70.9	82.2	20.4	26.2	13.9	20.6
German	96.3	97.7	5.4	6.9	5.0	6.6
Ukrainian	96.0	97.8	4.2	4.8	4.0	4.7
Chinese	75.6	75.1	2.6	4.0	2.3	3.1
Japanese	82.8	87.8	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.8
Native Indian	78.6	82.0	4.2	6.0	1.5	2.0
Inuktitut	47.4	54.4	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.5
Portuguese	62.4	71.0	12.7	16.1	7.2	10.2
Dutch	98.4	99.2	6.6	8.9	6.5	8.7
Flemish	96.3	96.8	28.2	31.7	26.1	30.1
Polish	93.7	95.2	9.6	11.7	8.9	11.0

Sources: 1971 Census of Canada, Bulletin SP-6, Table 1.
1981 Census of Canada, Volume 1, Table 1.

Only the Flemish, Italian, Portuguese and (in 1981) Polish mother tongue categories showed more than 10 percent able to speak French. In contrast, in virtually all the groups more than half of the group's members is able to speak English. Even for the Inuit, the proportion moved from 47.4 percent in 1971 to 54.4 percent in 1981. Tables 3.9 through 3.11 also show the increase in the attraction of English between 1971 and 1981. Despite the fact that several of the language communities increased as a result of international migration (in particular the Chinese and the Portuguese), the shift to English home language increased for all groups except the Chinese. During the same period, the ability to speak English increased for all groups, the Chinese again forming an exception. During this decade, the proportions able to speak French increased for virtually all groups, but these increases had only marginal effects on the shift to French home language. Only for the small Flemish group was there a notable increase in the shift to French. In this case, however, we are dealing with very small numbers (the number of people of Flemish mother tongue who spoke French most often in the home amounted to 875 in 1981).

Discussions in chapter 2 and in preceding sections of this chapter should now have made the point that the rather uneven spatial distribution of the various language communities should have an impact on their tendency to shift to English or French, or to maintain their mother tongue as the language spoken most often in the home. Thus, we should expect the highest propensities to shift to English, within a given language community, in provinces where they have the lowest concentration. For the relatively few who shift to French we should expect a higher propensity in Quebec than in the rest of the country. We already saw, in Table 2.11, that the propensities of the English and French regional language minorities to shift to the regional majority language was very much a function of their relative concentration. We do find similar patterns, by province, for the other language communities. Consider Tables 3.12 and 3.13.

The data for 1971, in Table 3.12, show once more the relative weakness of the French language communities in the Atlantic provinces except New Brunswick, as well as the provinces west of Quebec. In particular, the three western provinces and the Northern Territories have French language communities in which over half of those of French mother tongue have shifted to English home language.

For the immigrant language communities, we see that the attraction of English is generally greatest in the provinces in which their size was smallest. While the patterns vary between different groups, those in British Columbia tend to have high levels of shift to English home language, with most groups showing more than half to have shifted. In contrast, the lowest proportions shifting to English home language are generally found in Quebec and Ontario, the provinces in which the majority of the international immigrants from the period after World War II settled.

TABLE 3.12: Percentage of Mother Tongue Group Shifting to English Home Language, by Province, Canada, 1971

	Newfoundland	Prince Edward Island	Nova Scotia	New Brunswick	Quebec	Ontario	Manitoba	Saskatchewan	Alberta	British Columbia	Yukon	Northwest Territories
French	43	43	34	9	2	30	37	58	54	73	73	51
Italian	-	-	55	-	11	23	30	58	38	44	-	-
German	70	-	80	71	48	58	54	77	70	69	76	74
Ukrainian	-	-	65	-	32	48	56	58	65	78	-	-
Chinese	28	-	18	23	17	21	33	27	27	27	-	-
Japanese	-	-	-	-	35	48	57	-	54	45	-	-
Native Indian	2	-	19	19	16	32	24	24	32	59	63	30
Inkutitut	20	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
Portuguese	-	-	-	-	10	15	14	-	26	27	-	-
Dutch	-	70	82	86	61	78	64	77	77	81	-	-
Flemish	-	-	-	-	29	70	78	89	81	86	-	-
Polish	-	-	76	-	35	46	61	68	61	70	-	-

Source: 1971 Census Canada, Bulletin SP-6, Table 2.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3.13: Percentage of Mother Tongue Group Shifting to English Home Language, by Province, Canada, 1981

	Newfoundland	Prince Edward Island	Nova Scotia	New Brunswick	Quebec	Ontario	Manitoba	Saskatchewan	Alberta	British Columbia	Yukon	Northwest Territories
French	57	42	37	10	2	34	44	63	57	72	70	54
Italian	-	-	68	-	18	36	43	61	51	54	-	-
German	-	-	79	68	54	67	59	79	71	76	78	-
Ukrainian	-	-	88	-	39	59	68	69	75	84	-	-
Japanese	-	-	-	-	42	52	52	-	55	45	-	-
Native Indian	-	-	16	48	18	30	26	29	38	60	-	32
Inkutitut	37	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
Portuguese	-	-	-	-	9	23	25	51	33	38	-	-
Dutch[1]	-	65	89	83	51	84	77	84	83	84	-	-
Polish	-	-	75	-	42	53	64	72	63	69	-	-
Chinese	25	-	32	24	19	20	17	28	22	24	-	-

Note 1: Includes Flemish and Frisian.

Source: 1981 Census Canada, Volume 1, Table 2.

93

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

By 1981, these patterns had generally maintained themselves, or even intensified. Again, we see the weakness of the peripheral French mother tongue communities. Well over half of those in Newfoundland and in the provinces west of Manitoba had shifted to English home language. The proportions increased in virtually all of the provinces (the exceptions were Prince Edward Island, British Columbia and the Yukon), even in Alberta where during the period 1976-1981 many thousands of Francophone migrants arrived from Quebec, as we saw earlier in this chapter.

For the immigrant language communities, we again find the pattern of generally lower proportions shifting to English in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and higher proportions shifting in the western provinces. It is only for the most recently arrived immigrant groups (Portuguese and Chinese) that language shift to English has affected only a minority of the group's members. Such data suggest that only the steady influx of new immigrants could allow these groups to maintain themselves for more than a few generations.

For Canada's native people, language shift to English appears to be a less common phenomenon. Among the Inuit, this affected no more than about 10 percent. These low values of language shift are almost certainly associated with their settlement in the more inhospitable parts of the Northwest Territories, where they form the largest group. The Amerindians, finally, had approximately one-third shift to English home language, a proportion which did not change much between 1971 and 1981. An exception was formed by the Canadian Indians in British Columbia, of whom over half had shifted to English home language.

The generally lower shift to English in Quebec may of course be attributed partly to the presence, in that province, of a large French language community. Especially after 1977, language legislation in that province made it more useful for immigrants to acquire French than to acquire English, since it is likely that they would be required to use French at work and in other public domains. For Quebec, we should therefore consider the shift to French as well as the shift to English. Consider Table 3.14: we see a number of quite remarkable things here.

First of all, the shift to French was much lower than the shift to English for virtually all the minority language communities. The only groups for which French proved to have some drawing power were the Italians, the Portuguese and the Flemish. In the case of the first two, we are dealing with people whose mother tongues were also Romance languages; if they had learned other languages prior to coming to Canada, it is more likely that that would be French than English. The Flemish speakers have their origins in Belgium, a country in which Dutch and French are the official languages. Here again it is likely that quite a few of these people would have learned French, rather than English, before settling in North America. The second fact which should be noted is that the developments in Quebec apparently had little effect on the shift to French, while the shift to English appears to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3.14: Percentage of Mother Tongue Group Shifting to French or English Home Language. Quebec, 1971 and 1981.

	To English		To French		Total Shift	
Mother Tongue	1971	1981	1971	1981	1971	1981
Italian	11	18	12	11	23	29
German	48	54	11	12	59	66
Ukrainian	32	39	5	7	36	46
Chinese	17	19	3	2	20	21
Japanese	35	42	2	7	38	49
Native Indian	16	18	2	2	18	20
Inuktitut	2	2	0	0	2	2
Portuguese	10	9	11	14	21	23
Dutch	61	51(1)	10	29(1)	70	80(1)
Flemish	29	-	42	-	71	-
Polish	35	42	7	8	43	50

Note 1: Includes Flemish and Frisian

Sources: As in Tables 3.12 and 3.13.

have continued unabatedly. A peculiar outcome of this is that the Italians, for whom in 1971 French appears to be slightly more attractive than English, seem to have drifted towards English instead. Only for the Portuguese language community was French a somewhat stronger attraction in 1981 than was English. The same may have been the case for the Flemish, though no data are available to confirm or falsify this.

I already alluded to the fact that the survival of linguistic minorities, especially those associated with immigrants, depends to a large degree on the continued stream of new arrivals, who speak their mother tongue fluently and who have not (yet) had enough exposure to the majority language to shift to that language in the home. For this assertion to be tenable we should find that language shift to English home language is higher for those born in Canada than for the foreign-born. Moreover, we should expect that language shift increases with increasing length of residence in Canada for persons born outside Canada. For 1971 data were available for a small set of mother tongue categories. See Table 3.15.

We find, indeed, that these assertions are by and large supported by the data. In general, the propensity to shift to English home language is higher for those born in Canada than for the foreign-born. A curious exception to this overall pattern is formed by the foreign-born French, who are more likely to shift to English than are the Canadian-born persons of French mother tongue. A partial explanation for this unusual tendency may be that

the foreign-born of French mother tongue are less likely to be concentrated in the province of Quebec than are those born in Canada. Of the former group, 74.1 percent lived in Quebec (while for the total French mother tongue group the corresponding figure was almost 85 percent). This tendency to

TABLE 3.15: Percentage of Mother Tongue Group Shifting to English Home Language, by Place of Birth and Period of Immigration, Canada, 1971

		Foreign Born			
	Born in Canada	Period of Immigration			
		Before 1946	1946-1955	1956-1960	1961-1971
French	5.8	22.1	21.7	15.9	9.1
German	71.2	69.5	56.9	54.9	38.5
Italian	35.0	47.4	21.4	15.4	8.4
Dutch	72.6	84.7	82.3	78.6	54.4
Polish	73.5	47.3	40.4	32.0	21.6
Scandinavian	93.1	93.4	87.4	82.2	57.3
Ukrainian	71.0	30.1	20.3	20.4	17.0

Source: 1971 Census of Canada, unpublished data.

settle outside Quebec was strongest for those who immigrated before 1946 (65.9 percent), weakest for those who arrived between 1961 and 1965 (82.6 percent). Moreover, it is likely that those who settled in Quebec would choose the Montreal metropolitan area, in which the language shift to English is most pronounced in the province, even for members of the French language community. However, this overrepresentation of the foreign-born French outside Quebec is not sufficiently large to provide a full explanation of their higher tendency to shift to English. While it is tempting to provide further "explanations" based on the "closed nature" of French Canadian society, we do not have the necessary data to substantiate any further explanations of this somewhat anomalous pattern.

Most of the other groups show exactly the postulated pattern of highest language shift for those born in Canada, decreasing propensities to shift as we consider the more recent immigrants. The obvious exceptions here are the Italians and the Dutch. Again, settlement patterns of the Canadian-born in these two language communities may provide the answer.

More detailed analyses of the patterns of language shift in the immigrant language communities indicate that only about 15 to 20 percent of the Canadian-born young adults maintain their mother tongue as home language (see Lachapelle and Henripin, 1982:126 for detailed figures; also de Vries and Vallee, 1980:122). Even in the case where these adults married spouses of the same language community, chances are that only 15 to 20 percent of their

children would have the mother tongue as home language, while the remainder would shift to English - both as home language and as mother tongue.

With regards to the effects of language shift on the official language minorities in the various regions, we already saw in chapter 2 that, generally such shift has rather strong adverse effects on the maintenance of these groups. Lachapelle and Henripin give a detailed picture of the tendencies to shift for persons aged 25-44 in 1971, which reiterates the comments made earlier in this book. The only regions where the English mother tongue community is strongly affected by language shift are the "Interior" and "Peripheral" parts of Quebec (which are together virtually identical with the "Quebec Heartland" which was used in chapter 2). For the Interior region, shift towards French home language involved 38.3 percent of English mother tongue, with the corresponding figure for the Periphery being 18.2 percent. In contrast, language shift for the French mother tongue outside Quebec claimed 39.9 percent of the group, ranging from a lowest value of 8.9 percent in northern New Brunswick to a highest value of 64.5 percent in "Interior" Ontario (comparable to the "Upper Canada" region we used earlier)(Lachapelle and Henripin, 1982:136).

Much more can be stated about specific characteristics of language shift, but that would bring us too far from the emphasis of this chapter. Earlier analyses which do provide these details may be found in Lachapelle and Henripin (1982: chapter 5) and in de Vries and Vallee (1980: chapter 5).

Linguistic intermarriage

When we take a closer look at language shift, we find that it may occur in two major forms. In analogy to the study of social mobility, we may call these intragenerational language shift (in which individuals "move" form one language to another one) and intergenerational language shift (in which parents belonging to one language community have children belonging to a different language community). The preceding section of this chapter has dealt with the first form, since we compared the mother tongue of individuals with their home language. It is obviously the case that the second form is generally associated with the first one: if we have a situation in which, for example, French mother tongue parents have children whose mother tongue is English (recall that "mother tongue" refers to the "language first learned/spoken and still understood"), it is fair to assume that the parents must have used a lot of English at home when their children were young, perhaps to the degree that they themselves had undergone intragenerational language shift.

An important factor in the intergenerational shifting process is the propensity of members of minority language communities to marry spouses belonging to the majority language. This propensity is not uniformly distributed over the country, but is inversely correlated with the relative

density of the group in a region. In other words, the smaller the proportion of a regional population belonging to a minority language community, the larger the propensity of its members to marry partners belonging to the linguistic majority. Lachapelle and Henripin (1980:153-165) conducted some analyses, based on the 1971 census. See Table 3.16, which shows the proportions of spouses in various mother tongue categories who were married to someone of the same mother tongue.

Obviously, by subtraction from 100 percent we would obtain the proportions who married a partner with a different mother tongue. It is easy to see that, generally, members of language communities are more likely to marry out of their own group where they are a minority than where they are a majority - compare the value for the English in the Interior region of Quebec with that in the Atlantic provinces, or those for the French in the same regions. It is not difficult to postulate that those who marry outside their own language group have, generally, found partners belonging to the regional majority.

TABLE 3.16: Percentage of Married Couples in which the Spouse has the Same Mother Tongue, for Couples with Husbands Aged 25-44, by Sex, Mother Tongue and Region, Canada, 1971

	Males			Females		
	English	French	Other	English	French	Other
Canada	92.9	92.2	76.7	90.6	91.2	85.0
Quebec	78.4	97.1	81.6	79.1	96.1	89.7
Outaouais	66.4	94.0	55.4	69.6	92.4	68.1
Montreal	81.8	96.0	83.3	82.1	94.3	91.2
Eastern Townships	78.5	96.8	43.1	76.5	96.5	63.8
Interior	46.9	98.7	53.4	50.0	98.5	59.5
Periphery	66.0	98.5	77.9	69.9	98.0	85.9
New Brunswick	92.8	88.7	62.2	93.7	87.2	61.6
North East	86.9	92.0	65.1	88.7	90.8	63.6
South	95.7	57.3	60.3	96.1	54.3	60.3
Other Atlantic Provinces	97.7	60.1	66.5	97.6	58.9	69.9
Ontario	93.9	67.9	80.4	91.6	66.6	87.8
West and North	92.6	49.0	70.5	89.0	49.2	79.9

Source: Lachapelle and Henripin, 1980, Table 5.7.

In such cases, there is an additional form of pressure on the members of linguistic minorities to shift to the majority language: not only are they generally required to use the majority language in various public domains, they are also likely to use it at home and with other relatives. Lachapelle and Henripin have documented the shift to French and English for persons of English and French mother tongue respectively, in husband-wife families, by region. See Tables 3.17 and 3.18.

TABLE 3.17: Proportion Shifting to French Home Language of English Mother Tongue Persons in Husband-Wife Families with Heads Aged 25-44, by Mother Tongue of Spouse and Region, Canada, 1971

	Mother Tongue of Spouse		
	English	French	Other
Canada	0.2	14.4	0.2
Quebec	2.2	38.4	3.0
Outaouais	3.1	23.7	3.0
Montreal	1.7	33.8	2.2
Eastern Townships	2.9	44.5	3.7
Interior	11.4	61.3	19.4
Periphery	4.7	48.6	16.0
New Brunswick	0.3	9.3	0.0
North-East	0.6	13.6	0.0
South	0.2	1.7	0.0
Other Atlantic Provinces	0.0	2.4	0.0
Ontario	0.1	3.9	0.1
West and North	0.0	1.3	0.0

Source: Lachapelle and Henripin, 1980, Table 5.9.

As we would expect, there is indeed a substantial effect from the mother tongue of the spouse: shift to French is more likely for persons of English mother tongue if their spouse has French as mother tongue and if they reside in the areas in which English forms only a small minority in the population (e.g., in Quebec's Interior and Periphery, over half of these people shifted to French home language); the same is true for the French in those regions where they formed a minority: high proportions shifted to English in those regions where their spouse was of English mother tongue and where they formed

TABLE 3.18: Proportions Shifting to English Home Language by French Mother Tongue Persons in Husband-Wife Families with Heads Aged 25-44, by Mother Tongue of Spouses and Region, Canada, 1971

	Mother Tongue of Spouse		
	English	French	Other
Canada	76.9	2.6	58.3
Quebec	45.7	0.8	24.4
Outaouais	56.2	1.5	40.0
Montreal	50.7	1.0	24.6
Eastern Townships	39.0	0.6	14.0
Interior	24.4	0.4	20.8
Periphery	34.4	0.5	22.9
New Brunswick	80.6	4.9	61.8
North-East	73.2	3.3	52.0
South	93.7	28.3	80.0
Other Atlantic Provinces	92.1	18.8	81.0
Ontario	89.8	15.6	80.5
West and North	96.4	32.8	91.9

Source: Lachapelle and Henripin, 1980, Table 5.10.

only a small minority. Even in some regions of Quebec (Outaouais and Montreal region), the French mother tongue spouse was more likely to shift to English home language than the English mother tongue to shift to French (if we compare Tables 3.17 and 3.18, we see that 33.8 percent of the English partners in Montreal shifted to French, in the case of English-French marriages, while 50.7 percent of the French partners in these same marriages shifted to English).

An interesting conclusion one can draw from the information in Tables 3.17 and 3.18 is that in some of the English-French marriages neither of the spouses shifted to the other language (by adding the columns "French" in Table 3.17 and "English" in Table 3.18 and subtracting the sum from 100 percent). These percentages appear to be much greater in Quebec (15.9; 20.1 percent in the Outaouais) than in the remainder of the country (2.3 percent in the West and North).

Finally, we should realize that the tendency for linguistic exogamy (i.e., marrying outside one's language community) appears to be increasing,

at least for the French mother tongue minorities outside Quebec. Consider Table 3.19.

We see there that for almost every province the proportions of exogamous marriages - where the spouse was of English mother tongue - increased with decreasing age. In other words, younger couples were more likely to be linguistically mixed than were older couples. One conclusion from this is that more recently married couples were more likely to be mixed than couples who married earlier. There are some alternative explanations for the patterns in Table 3.19, but they do not appear to be very tenable. One is that a significant proportion of previously mixed marriages has become linguistically homogamous as a consequence of "mother tongue drift" of the minority partner (i.e., the French mother tongue spouse in a French-English marriage may have begun to declare his or her mother tongue as English). Another possible explanation is that divorce rates were much higher for linguis-

TABLE 3.19: Percentage of Francophones in Husband-Wife Families whose Spouse was of English Mother Tongue, by Province and Age Group, Canada, 1971

	15-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Newfoundland	41.9	42.0	31.0	45.6	37.5	50.0
Prince Edward Island	55.0	40.6	34.0	17.8	17.3	15.0
Nova Scotia	48.9	41.8	37.0	30.6	23.2	17.0
New Brunswick	13.2	12.3	10.8	9.5	7.3	4.6
Ontario	35.5	33.8	30.9	27.9	23.0	17.0
Manitoba	45.7	40.6	34.8	28.1	23.0	18.0
Saskatchewan	59.2	55.1	46.6	38.3	33.5	23.4
Alberta	56.5	56.3	51.4	43.1	35.1	29.3
British Columbia	68.1	63.4	60.3	60.2	55.7	46.8

Source: Castonguay, 1979:36.

tically mixed marriages than for homogamous marriages. The reason why neither of these logical possibilities appears tenable is that the postulated processes must have had extremely high values for these explanations to fit.

Although we do not have direct evidence, it would seem likely that these linguistically mixed marriages are an important factor in intergenerational language shift: it is unlikely that a couple in which the French mother tongue partner has shifted to the use of English in the home will raise their children with French as mother tongue.

Summary

We have considered the effects of various demographic processes on the fate of the language communities in Canada. I have shown that a careful analysis of this kind is, in fact, impossible given the lack of required

data. The various components (natural increase, net migration, net language shift) have been estimated by various researchers, but such estimates do suffer from being unreliable and being, to a large degree, functions of the basic assumptions on which the estimation technique was based. Nevertheless, the main factors identified in the preceding sections are sufficiently strong that they cannot just be artifacts of the estimation procedures.

In general, natural increase per se has little effect on the chances of survival of a language community. Fertility differences, while undoubtedly real, have only small impacts, which are probably more than cancelled out by the effects of language shift. Mortality differences similarly have only minimal effects. For immigrant communities, international migration is the main factor in increasing the size of the group; international migration also has a positive impact on the English language community, while - at least for the period 1966-1981 - the French language community was not significantly affected by the results of net migration.

Language shift, however, has generally reduced the impact of international migration on the growth of immigrant language communities. Large proportions of the Canadian-born segment of these groups appear to have adopted English as home language and are likely to pass on English as mother tongue to their children. While English is thus an obvious beneficiary, in the long run, of international migration, the same cannot be said of French. Only some immigrant groups residing in Quebec appear to have had some preference for a shift to French; in 1971, this was mainly the case with the Italians, the Portuguese and the Flemings. The last group, however, was quite small in comparison to most other immigrant communities in Quebec.

With regards to the regional official language minorities, we saw that language shift is also likely to play a major role here. Especially the Francophone minorities west of Quebec appear to be very vulnerable to losses due to language shift. It is only the French in northern New Brunswick which appear to be fairly resistant to the pressures of language shift. Within Quebec, only the English minorities in the Interior and Peripheral regions of the province appear to experience comparable declines through language shift. These regions together, however, contained less than 10 percent of the English mother tongue population in 1971 and 1981.

CHAPTER 4: LANGUAGE USE IN PUBLIC DOMAINS

Introduction

The preceding chapters have provided an initial idea about the size, and spatial distribution, of language communities in Canada during the 1970s. The analyses were based primarily on data from the population censuses of 1971, 1976 and 1981. Because of the difficulty in obtaining more appropriate data, they were derived from tabulations of the population by mother tongue, despite the fact that the "mother tongue" criterion has obvious deficiencies for the quantitative study of language communities. We also used the 1971 and 1981 census data on "language spoken most often at home," partly to indicate the degree to which the boundaries of language communities are a function of the definition of membership and partly to provide estimates of language shift (from a particular mother tongue to a different language used most often in the home). You may want to look, again, at Table 2.3 for an overview of the patterns of language used at home, as recorded in these census data. You will then recall that - based on the criterion "language used most often in the home" - few of the immigrant language communities had more than 100,000 members in 1981: only the Italian, German, Portuguese and Chinese communities exceeded this (arbitrarily chosen) limit. Note the contrasting movements for Portuguese and Ukrainian: during the decade 1971-1981, the Portuguese increased from well under 100,000 to well above it; during the same decade, the Ukrainians declined to just under 100,000. Given the migration histories of these two groups, these trends are not at all surprising.

While the phrasing of the "home language" criterion means that the number of persons using these languages in the home is underestimated by this measure, it is not likely that the underestimation is all that severe. Thus, the size of these "other" language communities, combined with their dispersion across several provinces, indicates that most of them are likely to have relatively small local communities, in which the use of the language is continually threatened with extinction.

For a language community to have viability in the long run, use of that language in the home is almost certainly not sufficient. Members of the language community should have the opportunity to use their language in other domains, particularly the more "public" domains such as the work world, the school system and the mass media. This concern has been clearly manifested, for example, by the leaders of various Francophone minorities outside Quebec (see, for example, F.F.H.Q. 1977, 1978). While data on language use in these domains are (even) harder to obtain than those on home language, it is essential that we consider the available evidence. Thus, the remainder of this chapter will deal with language use at work, in education and in the mass media.

Language use at work

When we consider patterns of language use in the work world, we realize very quickly that almost no national data can be found. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism devoted one very large volume to "the Work

World" (Books 3A and 3B), but the main component of this tome deals with language practices in the Federal Government and several Crown Corporations. The book dealing with the "Private Sector" is much shorter and concentrates almost entirely on Quebec. While it is in no way meant to downplay the language practices in Federal Government, this means that we have little information about language use at work for the private sector (outside the province of Quebec).

The report's data on Federal civil servants are for 1965, that is before the Official Languages Act was passed, and before the various national and provincial language policies were implemented. The various tables clearly document the dominance of English, for persons of all mother tongues. This pattern is shown clearly in Tables 4.1 and 4.2. The discrepancy in "optimum language" on entry into the public service (where nearly 10 percent of the respondents of French mother tongue reported English, whereas the counterpart for English was only 0.1 percent) increased in the intervening years: in 1965, only 31.9 percent of the Francophone respondents reported that French was their optimum language (with most of the shift going to "both").

In contrast, there was almost no shift in the respondents of English or other mother tongues. Table 4.2 tells us moreover that over half of the respondents with French as mother tongue used English at work at least half of the time whereas only 2 percent of the English mother tongue respondents were using French at least half of the time. Simlarly, 85.6 percent of the English respondents never used French at work, while only 6.6 percent of the French respondents never used English.

More detailed tabulations from the same data base indicate that this dominance of English also holds for those public servants who feel equally comfortable with French and English: for 51.5 percent of these, English is the language used either exclusively or as the dominant working language, in contrast to only 29.3 percent for French. In fact, 6.4 percent of these bilinguals never uses French, while only 1.3 percent never uses English (RCBB, 1969:380).

TABLE 4.1: Percentage Distribution of Federal Departmental Public Servants within Mother Tongue Groups, by Optimum Working Language on Entry into the Public Service and in 1965

	French		English		Other	
Optimum Language	Entry	1965	Entry	1965	Entry	1965
French	57.4	31.9	0.1	0.1	1.7	0.5
English	9.8	13.3	98.3	98.0	95.4	96.7
Both	32.8	54.8	1.6	1.9	2.9	2.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	1,487	1,487	6,852	6,852	819	819

Source: R.C.B.B., 1969:125.

In addition to these data for federal public servants in the 1960's, we do have a lot of information on language use in the province of Quebec. A study conducted on firms operating in the province indicated that, even outside the Montreal region, employees in the higher salary ranges were generally required to know English. Of the Anglophones in Quebec outside Montreal, 41 percent were not required to use French at work. In the Montreal Metropolitan Area, English had an even stronger position: only 14 percent of the Anglophones in the upper salary levels were required to speak French at work, whereas 78 percent of the Francophones had to use English. In summary, the Royal Commission's report states that "... These figures on Montreal and the rest of Quebec leave no doubt that English was the language of business communication in the middle and higher echelons of the Quebec manufacturing industry" (1969:462).

TABLE 4.2: Percentage Distribution of Federal Departmental Public Servants of French and English Mother Tongue, by Frequency of Use of French and English at Work, Canada, 1965

	French		English	
	Use of		Use of	
	French	English	French	English
Always	11.4	7.5	0.4	87.8
Most of the Time	27.4	32.0	0.4	9.0
About Half of the Time	22.2	20.0	1.2	1.1
Fairly Frequently	16.2	17.4	1.2	0.2
Occasionally	17.6	16.5	11.2	0.5
Never	5.2	6.6	85.6	1.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	1,487	1,487	6,852	6,852

Source: R.C.B.B., 1969:142.

This information on language use in Quebec was updated in the beginning of the 1970's by the "Commission of Inquiry on the Position of the French Language and on Language Rights in Quebec," instituted by the provincial government of the time. I will refer to this commission as the "Gendron Commission," named after its chairman. Based on a combination of survey data (collected especially for the commission) and data from the 1971 census, we can derive the following information about language use at work in the province of Quebec around 1970.

These data are obviously quite consistent with those reported for about a decade earlier, and with the demographic accounts in chapter 3. Both English and French are used to a large extent by members of all language communities. The use of languages other than English or French was obviously

not common: only 10 percent of those of other mother tongues used a language other than English or French at work. The remainder shows the already recorded tendency to adopt English, rather than French, as working language.

TABLE 4.3: Language Used at Work, by Mother Tongue, Quebec Labour Force, January, 1971

Mother Tongue	Almost Exclusively French	Almost Exclusively English	Both Languages	Other Languages
French	64%	3%	32%	1%
English	5%	63%	32%	-
Other	14%	36%	40%	10%

Source: Gendron Commission, Book I, Table 1.3.

It should be noted that membership in a language community other than French or English did not lead to lower labour force participation: the labour force participation rates for Quebec in 1970 were lowest for the French mother tongue population, highest for the English group and intermediate for those of other mother tongues (Gendron, 1972:12-14), but the range in participation rates was quite narrow.

While the data by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism suggested that English had a somewhat dominant position as language at work in the early 1960s in Quebec, the Gendron Commission's data show highly comparable patterns of language use for the French and English in 1971: in both groups, approximately one-third used both English and French at work, the remaining two-thirds use their mother tongue most often. Somewhat over one-third in either group must (obviously) be bilingual to satisfy the job requirements: 35 percent for the French, 37 percent for the English, but only about half of them have to be able to speak French.

From the earlier analyses of regional variations in language composition and language shift, it should be clear that the Quebec labour force did not function uniformly with regards to the use of language at work. The demographic analyses in chapters 2 and 3 showed a strong contrast between the "Quebec Heartland" (roughly equal to the combination of "Interior Quebec" and "Peripheral Quebec" used by Lachapelle and Henripin) in which French was a majority language with a dominant position, and the "Bilingual Belt" (further broken down by Lachapelle and Henripin) in which English and French both had viable language communities. Remember that the "Bilingual Belt," which showed up in chapter 2, contained some counties in New Brunswick and in Ontario; the majority of the population of this region, however, lived in Quebec.

The Gendron Commission, consistent with the work done earlier for the Royal Commission, partitioned the province into two components: the Montreal Metropolitan Area and the rest of the province. In approximate terms, the

former is comparable to the Quebec part of the Bilingual Belt, while the latter coincides roughly with our "Quebec Heartland." The Montreal Metropolitan Area contained about 76 percent of the province's English mother tongue labour force, 89 percent of the labour force of "other" mother tone, but only 41 percent of the labour force of French mother tongue (Gendron, 1972:15). The Gendron Commission asked respondents in their sample to indicate what percentage of their working time they used English and French. The data, in Table 4.4, show the contrast between the two segments of the province.

TABLE 4.4: Percentage of Working Time in which French or English was Used, by Mother Tongue and Region, Quebec Labour Force, 1971

	Montreal			Rest of the Province		
	Mother Tongue			Mother Tongue		
Language Used	English	French	Other	English	French	Other
French	16%	78%	33%	30%	93%	62%
English	84%	22%	67%	70%	7%	38%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: Gendron Commission, 1972, Table I.12.

Before we continue, you should realize that the measure used in this table is somewhat difficult to interpret. The fact that 16 percent of the working hours of the English mother tongue sample in Montreal were spent in French may have many different interpretations. It may, for example, mean that all of these persons used some French, averaging to 16 percent. It could also mean that 16 percent used nothing but French and the remaining 84 percent used nothing but English. The real interpretation lies, of course, somewhere in between: some people used no French at all, some used no English at all, the remainder varied in its use of French and English and the average on all of this came to 16 percent French usage.

Despite these difficulties of precise interpretation, we can make general comparisons with the data in preceding tables. Very obviously, the strong position of English as a language of work in the Montreal Metropolitan Area persisted to the early 70's. Remember that English home language use for the French language community in the Bilingual Belt was only 4 percent (see Table 2.10). Lachapelle and Henripin report that the value for persons 25-44 years old in the Montreal region was only 3 percent (1982:136). In contrast, 22 percent of the work time of persons of French mother tongue in the Montreal region was spent using English. Even in the remainder of the province (where home language shift was less than one percent for the French mother tongue community), 7 percent of the work time of French mother tongue workers was spent in English.

The strength of English as a language of work in the Montreal economy also showed up for workers of English and "other" mother tongues: well over two-thirds of the working hours for these respondents were spent in English. Note, however, that the percentage of time spent in French at work was probably higher than the percentage of time French was used at home by these people.

The contrast between data on language use at work, as suggested in Tables 4.3 and 4.4, and data on home language use, as detailed in Table 2.11, gives us a hint that individuals indeed have language use patterns which vary by domain: the work language reflects a more public behaviour, in which individuals adapt to the immediate economic environment. In contrast, home language is a reflection on "private" behaviour, in which the economic environment plays a smaller role. The fact that large proportions of especially minority language groups behave differently in these two domains (and almost certainly in various other domains as well) suggests that individuals can, and do, maintain relatively high levels of what we might call "domain segregation." The joint use of the various data suggests that this "domain segregation" was least operative for the English mother tongue workers in the parts of Quebec outside Montreal. Table 4.4 indicated that about 30 percent of the working hours of these persons was spent using French; Table 2.11 indicated a virtually identical propensity to shift to French home language for the English mother tongue population in the Quebec Heartland. Lachapelle and Henripin indicate comparable values for the population aged 25-44 years, with higher values for "Interior Quebec" and slightly lower values for "Peripheral Quebec" (136). The attraction of French on members of other language communities in Quebec, finally, seems also to have been restricted to the part of the province outside the Montreal Metropolitan Area: for these persons, 40 percent had shifted to French as home language, while 62 percent of the working time for workers was spent in French.

It may be interesting to note that a survey conducted in 1979 found that Francophones reported having much better opportunities for using French at work than they did in 1971 (in 1971, 46 percent of those who had experienced some difficulty in using French in various public domains specified that these problems occurred in their daily work; the corresponding figure for 1979 was 1.3 percent). For Anglophones, values for 1971 and 1979 were about the same (6 percent in 1971, 8.7 percent in 1979). (Breton and Grant, 1981:71-72).

Before we discuss language use at work for the other provinces, we should consider the little bit of evidence we have for one of the "other" language communities in Quebec. One of the case studies conducted for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism dealt with the Italians in Montreal. This study is based in part on a questionnaire for a sample of 197 male household heads of Italian descent, living in the Montreal area in the middle of 1965. (Boissevain, 1970: xii). These sample data indicate that 21.6 percent of the respondents used only Italian at work, an additional

36.3 percent used some Italian, while only 42.1 percent of the respondents did not use any Italian at all at work. The relatively high usage of Italian may be explained in part by the fact that 90 percent of the respondents were foreign-born. Moreover, the linguistic segmentation of the Montreal labour market, at least for the Italians, is indicated by the fact that 31 percent of the respondents stated that their supervisor or employer was Italian, and that 46 percent of their workmates were Italian (Boissevain, 1970:16). Other observations by Boissevain indicate that a large proportion of his respondents were employed as craftsmen and relatively unskilled labourers employed in the construction industry (1970:14-15). Further analyses show that about 15 percent of the respondents used French exclusively at work and an additional 50 percent used some French on the job. Comparable figures for English were 10 percent and 38 percent. Thus, the slight dominance of French for workers in the Italian language community during the 1960's is again demonstrated in these data on language use at work (Boissevain, 1970:46). As we saw in chapter 3, it appears that this pattern changed at some time between 1971 and 1981.

For the remainder of the country, we do not have access to such detailed data on language use at work as we do for Quebec. Several national surveys contain some information on language at work. The most recent one of these surveys is the Canadian National Mobility Survey which was organized by a team of researchers from Carleton University and McMaster University, with data collected in July 1973. The sample design for this survey includes persons 18 years and over and excludes residents of the Northern Territories, inmates of institutions and members of the non-civilian labour force. Table 4.5 gives the language used on the respondent's current job, by mother tongue, in this sample.

While the data in Tables 4.3, 4.4. and 4.5 are not strictly comparable, a comparison of the patterns allows us to draw some inferences. Recall, before anything, that Table 4.5 refers to virtually all of the Canadian labour force, while Tables 4.3 and 4.4 refer to Quebec only. The main observation is that English is the predominant language at work, both for males and for females, except for the population of French mother tongue in Quebec. Table 4.5 shows that somewhat less than 5 percent of the English mother tongue respondents works in French (partly or entirely); the data from Tables 4.3 and 4.4 suggest that the great majority of these persons will be

TABLE 4.5: Language Used on Current Job, by Mother Tongue and Sex, Canada, 1973

	Male			Female		
	English	French	Other	English	French	Other
English Only	95.1	6.8	84.3	94.9	6.2	79.5
French Only	0.1	45.7	1.4	0.3	51.2	1.9
Both	4.7	47.4	9.2	4.7	42.5	8.8
Neither	0.1	0.1	5.1	0.1	0.1	9.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: CARMAC

found in Quebec and, for those working in French only, particularly in the parts of the province outside the Montreal Metropolitan Area and outside the Bilingual Belt. French appears to have a somewhat greater attraction as a work language for persons of other mother tongues; a little over 10 percent uses French either exclusively or combined with English. Languages other than English or French are obviously not viable as languages of work in Canada: only 5 percent of the males and 10 percent of the females of other mother tongue use a language other than English or French on their current job. If Boissevain's data for the Italian males in Montreal are representative for this category, this group is likely to be foreign-born, working as unskilled or semi-skilled labourer in linguistically segregated work settings (such as the construction industry, the garment industry and the restaurant business).

Finally, combined analysis of Tables 4.3 and 4.5 shows the weakness of the French language outside Quebec. For the entire CARMAC sample, a little over half of the persons of French mother tongue used English most often at work either exclusively or jointly with French. We also know that the great majority of the French mother tongue population lives in Quebec and so does a corresponding percentage of the French mother tongue labour force. If we assume this share to be about 85 percent, the data in Tables 4.3 and 4.5 can only be reconciled by assuming that virtually all of the French mother tongue persons employed outside Quebec will use English in their work, with a substantial proportion using it exclusively. This hunch is supported by Maxwell's findings. In a small survey he conducted among the French in Toronto in 1965, he found that 4 percent of his respondents spoke French most of the time at work, 86 percent spoke English most often, and 10 percent spoke both (Maxwell, 1977:96). The domain segregation, to which I referred earlier, between "work" and "home," is evident for these respondents: 85 percent spoke French most often with their children at home, but only 7 percent spoke English to the children most of the time. Maxwell's more detailed analyses on the work situation show that 64 percent of his gainfully employed respondents had at least some French fellow workers (suggesting

significant linguistic segmentation of employment, incidentally), but only 9 percent indicated that there were opportunities to speak French "all the time" (1977:98). Joint inspection of Maxwell's Tables 23 and 24 suggests that only a small proportion of these opportunities is used by his respondents to speak French in the work environment.

The final evidence we have on language use at work by members of other language communities in Canada comes from a survey of the "non-official languages," conducted in 1973 in five large Canadian cities, with respondents belonging to ten ethnic groups (all associated with a "non-official language"). One of the questions asked was "... which language or languages you would use today if you were speaking to different persons?" followed by a list of twelve possible settings, with nine different response categories. Among the twelve settings was that of "classmates or co-workers." The data are summarized in Table 4.6.

We again see the familiar pattern: relatively recent immigrant groups have fairly high proportions using a non-official language at work, whereas the "older" immigrant groups either never use the unofficial language on the

TABLE 4.6: Percentage of Respondents Using the Non-official Language with Co-workers, by Ethnic Group, Canada, 1973.

	Overall Use	Exclusive Use
Portuguese	37.3	8.9
Chinese	33.5	17.4
Greek	33.0	9.8
Italian	26.9	10.3
Ukrainian	16.3	11.0
Hungarian	15.7	11.5
German	9.3	0.4
Polish	7.2	2.9
Scandinavian	0.7	0.0
Dutch	0.6	0.0

Source: O'Bryan et al., 1976:64.

job, or use it only sporadically. Contrast the top six groups in Table 4.6 with the bottom four (they have been ordered by descending values in "overall use" for convenience) to note the difference. The rather high proportions of non-official language use for recent immigrants may have two explanations. On the one hand, recent immigration may be associated with the inability to speak English or French (thus resulting in the need to use some other language on the job, for those who are employed outside the home). On the other hand, the segmentation of the labour force may have placed many of these people in work settings with high concentrations of fellow workers who belong to the same language community. Evidence for this latter point is cited by Reitz (1980:80-81) for Greeks, Portuguese and Macedonians.

Language in education

I have already mentioned that people learn a language, at least in part, during their period of formal education. This may apply to a person's mother tongue and to the acquisition of other languages. With regards to mother tongue learning, schooling helps people to acquire the formal grammatical rules of their language, to learn the meanings of many words in the language and the proper spelling of these words (through the more cynical observer may doubt whether the last form of learning really takes place). In a similar fashion, second languages may be acquired in the school system.

Especially in industrial and post-industrial societies, the adequate functioning of workers requires that they are able to use the dominant language of communication well enough to obey instructions, both written and oral ones. There are, of course, several other basic skills which workers are expected to have acquired (such as arithmetic, an elementary sense of geography, an understanding of the way in which various public bureaucracies operate). As a consequence, modern governments have generally regulated the contents of school curricula to a fairly high degree. Radical interpretations of the role of public education will, in fact, go even further and assert that this control over curriculum merely reflects the control of the dominant class over the socialization of future members of the working class (see Bowles and Gintis, 1976, for the general statement of this kind). Pike (1980:112-124) provides a summary of this view for Canadian education. Leaving aside the business of motivation, we can see that the modern state has generally not only set standards for specific course offerings in primary and secondary schools, but has also specified which languages may be used in the school systems under its jurisdiction. Such regulations may pertain to the language used as the medium of instruction, as well as to (other) languages which may be taught as subjects.

In Canada, public education falls under the jurisdiction of the provinces. Thus we can, in principle, discuss twelve educational systems; in practice, there are very few different patterns with respect to the role of language in public education. Before we proceed with a description of these systems, I should point out that the Constitution will have some impact on the public education of official language minorities: parents are given the right to have their children educated in the official language of their choice (provided that such parents are citizens whose "first language" is English or French, or who were educated in Canada in English or French), "wherever numbers warrant" (Russell, 1982:453). The consequences of these provisions for the education of official language minority children may not be known for some time to come.

The existing language policies, as we knew them before the Constitution could produce major changes, reflect the great strength of the English language in all regions of Canada except the Quebec Heartland, the weakness of French outside Quebec and the extremely low viability of the other language communities in the country.

Quebec is the only province which has traditionally provided full educational systems in the two official languages of the country. Quebec's educational system has been structured along religious lines and can thus be subdivided into a Roman Catholic school system and a "Protestant" system (in which the latter, for example, has accommodated the large Jewish community in Montreal). Given the patterns of association between religion and language in Canada, the de facto situation has been that the Roman Catholic system has provided education for Francophone and Anglophone Catholics in the province, while the Protestant system provided schooling mostly in English for children whose religion was not Roman Catholic. We can, therefore, assert that the public education system in Quebec was composed of three subsystems: French Catholic, English Catholic and English Protestant (see RCBB, 1968:23-37). In Quebec, such public school systems provide education at all levels in both of Canada's official languages.

While these school systems exist for both Anglophones and Francophones, developments in Quebec society during the period 1968-1977 no longer make free access to the English school system available to all Quebec residents. During this period, several laws were passed which affected the rights of various children to attend the English school systems. These laws are known as Bill 85 (1968), Bill 63 (1969), Bill 22 (1974) and Bill 101 (1977). The latest one has imposed the most stringent restrictions on access to the English school systems. Access to these schools is only granted to children for whom at least one parent received his or her primary schooling in English in Quebec. By a transition rule, children could also be admitted if they were receiving schooling in English in 1976-1977, or if one of their siblings did. Moreover, children whose parents were living in Quebec at the time when the Bill took effect (August 26, 1977) could enter the English school system if at least one of the parents has been educated in English outside Quebec. In addition to these transitional categories, the Bill allows for some exemptions, mainly for children whose parents expect to reside in the province for three years or less (see Vanasse, 1981:8-9, for detailed descriptions of Bill 22 and Bill 101). As a consequence of these regulations, increasing proportions of Quebec's population will be enrolled in the French school system, particularly among those of other mother tongues. You may wish to contemplate the impact of this type of policy on patterns of school enrolment by following Vanasse's projections through 2001 (1981:41-55). More detailed discussion of the wider consequences of Bill 101 may be found in the papers by Laurin, Jackson and Rioux (1978).

In the other provinces, no equivalent of the Quebec situation can be found. All of them have complete school systems with English as the language of instruction. In contrast, no province has yet developed a full French-language system. The province of New Brunswick is closest: it provides primary and secondary education in French in districts with a sufficiently large concentration of Francophones. This means, in practice, that the Francophones in Northeastern New Brunswick have relatively full access to primary and secondary schooling in French, while such access is more difficult in the rest of the province (where, as we saw, the numbers and rela-

tive concentration of Francophones were quite low anyway). At the post-secondary level, the French school system in New Brunswick is not equal to the English system for the province. The University of Moncton is designated to be the Francophone counterpart to the largely English University of New Brunswick (RCBB, 1968:107-108), but currently offers a much more limited range of courses and programmes.

The other province in which we found a sizeable minority of Francophones was Ontario. This province has made considerable progress in providing public education in French for its minority, although this provision has not yet reached the same level obtained in New Brunswick, let alone that it approximates the English system in Quebec. The province's 1968 law on French instruction authorizes school boards to provide education in French "where numbers warrant." In practice, this again means that the concentrated Francophone minorities in Eastern Ontario and Northern Ontario have reasonably good access to instruction in French, while the remainder of the province's Francophones will find such access difficult to obtain. The fact that full access is not within the reach of all Franco-Ontarians is demonstrated by the regular incidence of disputes over French-language schooling (for example in Essex County) and the unwillingness of the provincial government to accommodate Ottawa's Francophone minority by allowing it to have an autonomous French Board of Education.

In the remaining provinces, Manitoba granted similar educational rights to its Francophone minority in 1970 ("where numbers warrant"), while the remaining provinces provide (even) less equality to their Francophone minorities.

There are several ways of looking at the effects of these provincial policies on enrolment in French language schools. Variations in outcome depend, in part, on definitions (e.g., how does one define a "French school?"). One way of looking at it is demonstrated in Table 4.7.

As Table 4.7 shows, the number of students enrolled in English-medium schools in Quebec exceeded the total number of students in French-medium schools in the rest of the country, until 1980-81. After that year, the enrolment in Quebec's English-medium schools continued to decline somewhat more rapidly than did that of French-medium schools in the rest of the country. Obviously, these values are meaningful only if we compare them with the potential number of students. As a somewhat crude approximation, we are taking the minority language population between the ages of 5 and 19 for the censuses of 1971, 1976, and 1981. Combining those data with the enrolment data from Table 4.7 (for 1970-71, 1976-77 and 1980-81) will tell us something about the degree to which the members of official language minorities are able to receive primary or secondary education in their own language. Consider Table 4.8.

TABLE 4.7: Students Enrolled in Schools with the Minority Language[1] as Language of Instruction[2] by Province - Selected Years

Province	1970-71	1976-77	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Newfoundland	185	200	125	127	123	103
Prince Edward Island	796	684	554	529	520	516
Nova Scotia	7,388	5,541	5,184	5,308	5,049	4,470
New Brunswick	60,679	53,813	49,316	48,614	48,194	47,761
Ontario	115,869	106,099	96,210	94,557	93,995	91,176
Manitoba	10,405	8,543	6,501	6,411	6,166	5,561
Saskatchewan	765	1,226	1,322	1,403	1,215	768
Alberta[3]						1,076
British Columbia	-	-	659	785	1,043	1,163
Quebec	248,855	221,237	158,541	148,114	137,678	128,408

Notes: (1) Minority language is defined as English in Quebec and French in all other provinces.
(2) Language of instruction refers to the language in which the students take all courses (not simply language courses).
(3) No data are available for Alberta until 1983-84.

Source: Minority and Second Language Education, Elementary and Secondary Levels, 1983-84. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Catalogue 81-257.

While it should be obvious that not all persons between the ages of 5 and 19 attend primary or secondary school, it is safe to assume that the great majority does so. Moreover, the distortions caused by the fact that some people in that age group do not attend school should be fairly uniform across the different provinces. There should also be little difference over time. With these assumptions in mind, let us see what Table 4.8 tells us.

First of all, the opportunity for French mother tongue children outside Quebec to receive education in their own language seems to have increased from 1970-71 to 1980-81. While there are minor "blips" in the data (but recall that this is a fairly crude analysis), the enrolment index increased for all of the provinces.

A second point to note is that, despite the notable improvement, access to minority language schools was reasonably high only in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario. For the remaining provinces, enrolment indexes were under 50 percent, with the exception of Manitoba, where about 60 percent of the French mother tongue children were enrolled in French language schools. More detailed data, not shown here, indicate that primary education in French was more readily available than secondary schooling, in all provinces. Thus, enrolment indexes well below 80 percent suggest that many

TABLE 4.8: Minority Language[1] Population Aged 5-19, and Enrolment Index[2] by Province, 1971, 1976 and 1981

	1971		1976		1981	
	Number	Index	Number	Index	Number	Index
Newfoundland	960	19.3	715	28.0	455	27.5
Prince Edward Island	2,270	35.1	1,850	37.0	1,190	46.6
Nova Scotia	9,220	80.1	7,880	70.3	5,925	87.5
New Brunswick	78,550	77.2	74,545	72.2	63,800	77.3
Ontario	140,580	82.4	126,725	83.7	101,240	95.0
Manitoba	17,435	59.7	14,275	59.8	9,980	65.1
Saskatchewan	7,975	9.6	5,565	22.0	3,700	35.7
Quebec	236,320	105.3	226,965	97.5	170,920	92.8

Notes: (1) Minority language is defined as English in Quebec, French in all other provinces.
(2) Enrolment index is the number of students enrolled in minority language schools as a percentage of the number of persons with the minority mother tongue, aged 5-19, in the population census.

Sources: 1971 Census of Canada, Bulletin 1.4-5, Table 11.
1981 Census of Canada, Catalogue 92-907, Table 9.

children of French mother tongue will, after having attended French language primary schools, have to attend English language secondary schools. Such a sequence is likely to contribute to eventual language shift by such pupils after they leave school (particularly since they almost certainly will have to work in English when they enter the labour force). Moreover, it is reasonable to assume that students who are required to attend school in their second language are likely to use a restricted code in that language. If Bernstein's arguments are correct, this will lead to lower educational attainment for these minority members. This point will be followed up in chapter 5.

Finally, there is the province of Quebec. For 1970-71, we note an enrolment index of over 100. In other words, the number of pupils in Quebec's English language schools exceeded the number of children of English mother tongue between the ages of 5 and 19. Such values indicate, of course, that children of other mother tongues (mostly neither French nor English) attended English language schools. The regular decline in the enrolment index, from 105 to 93, reflects the cumulative effects of Quebec's language laws. One of the aims of these laws was to reduce the inclination of the "other" mother tongue groups towards English as as the preferred language at work and at school. It is interesting to note that, as a consequence of the

different trends, the enrolment index for Ontario's French mother tongue minority exceeded that for Quebec's English mother tongue segment by 1981. It is not possible to tell whether this contrast was accidental or whether it was sustained in subsequent years.

Overall, then, we see that the dominance of English as a language at work is also shown in the school systems of the country. Outside Quebec, French is not available as a language of education to all pupils of French mother tongue. In particular, access to secondary schools seems less than complete. Especially the Francophone minorities outside Northern New Brunswick, Eastern and Northern Ontario appear to be affected by this absence of opportunities. The same lack of facilities does not seem to affect the Anglophones in Quebec (except perhaps in the Quebec heartland).

For the other language communities in the country, the school systems provide even fewer possibilities. No public school system anywhere in the country offers a curriculum in any of the immigrant languages (except as a temporary measure). In general, the teaching of immigrant languages takes place in part-time schools (weekday afternoons, evenings, Saturday classes), and in a very small number of private schools. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism reported that there were about 500 part-time "ethnic schools" in 1965-1966. Most of these schools were teaching Ukrainian or German. These part-time "schools" had a combined enrolment of approximately 40,000 students (R.C.B.C., 1970:149-151). The Commission also reported the existence of some 50 full-time private "ethnic" schools with an enrolment of about 9,000 students. Roughly half of these private "ethnic" schools were Jewish schools in which Hebrew may have been taught as a subject. Such teaching almost certainly had no effect on the mother tongues of its pupils (most of whom probably had English as mother tongue anyway). Thus, there may have been between 4,000 and 5,000 pupils, enrolled in private "ethnic" schools in 1965-1966, who received full-time education in other languages.

Hobart (1977:391-396) points out that the Inuit and Indians are not much better off, in this respect, than most other minority communities. Whatever education is available in the mother tongue seems to be restricted to the first three grades of the primary system. Moreover, such mother tongue instruction is generally made available if the parents wish it. Parents living on Indian reserves are more likely to request this if they reside in the Northern, more isolated, part of the country than if they reside in the Southern, more acculturated parts (1977:394). Here again, Native children who wish to progress beyond the primary level appear to be faced with multiple difficulties; they are likely to use a restricted code of the majority language, will have to attend school away from home and often have to internalize concepts which are not an integral part of their culture. Not surprisingly, educational success rates for such students are markedly below those of their majority-language counterparts.

Language and the mass media

The final domain for which we will consider language use is that of the mass media: radio, television, newspapers and periodicals. The mass media are, in developed societies, the most efficient means of communication between members of a language community: standardized messages (for example, local news, weather forecasts, announcements of auctions or school closings) can reach a potentially large audience cheaply and quickly. This type of message generally involves a "public" sender (such as a level of government, a large corporation) and the use of a "public," elaborated, code. (There are, of course, exceptions, such as the classified ads in newspapers and "neighbourhood columns" in weekly papers). It is, in fact, often quite important for individuals in these societies to have access to the mass media, to be informed about current events and to make decisions essential for the performance of their regular tasks (ranging all the way from decisions about the avoidance of traffic jams on the way to work, to decisions about the investing of several million dollars in a particular oil company). One may add that this utilitarian view is not necessarily the only one in support of access to the media: F.F.H.Q. argues that the media are also necessary for "... self-assertion, identification and expression, ... for promoting expression and creativity in all its forms" (1978:42). It is for many of these reasons that linguistic minorities in developed societies have made claims for access to the mass media, especially radio and television, in their own language. In other Western industrial societies containing several language communities, we have seen such demands among Swedish speakers in Finland (see, for example, Stomsholm, 1975) and the Welsh speakers in Wales.

Canadian radio and television broadcasting is regulated by the federal government, through the Canadian Radio and Television Commission (CRTC). Among the regulations set down by the CRTC are rules governing the language(s) of broadcasting. The only languages allowed to be used extensively are English, French, Inuktitut and North American Indian languages. Inuktitut is used by the Northern American Indian languages. Inuktitut is used by the Northern Service of the CBC in the Northwest Territories, while various Indian languages are used in the North and in other areas with relatively large groupings of speakers of such languages. Further regulations stipulate that no broadcasting station, whether publicly or privately owned, may broadcast in any other language for more than 15 percent of its broadcasting time in any week. Exceptions may be granted by the commission, but such exceptions may not result in any language being used more than 20 percent of the time (RCBB, 1970;185). Other regulations stipulate that everyone is entitled to broadcasting services in English and French "as public funds become available." While this rule should guarantee a high degree of access to broadcasting in their own language for the official language communities, the availability of public funds is, of course, such that smaller and more dispersed minorities do not have equal access to such services.

TABLE 4.9: Distribution of Television[1] and Radio Stations[1] by Language and Province, 1976 and 1982

	Television				Radio					
	English		French		English		French		Other	
	1976	1982	1976	1982	1976	1982	1976	1982	1976	1982
Newfoundland	67	132	3	4	48	79	3	4	1	2
Prince Edward Island	2	5	0	2	5	6	0	1	0	0
Nova Scotia	23	46	5	8	35	49	13	19	0	1
New Brunswick	11	18	7	9	24	37	10	16	0	0
Quebec[2]	12	38	79	137	35	54	130	207	1	15
Ontario[3]	71	103	16	33	171	249	34	52	4	4
Manitoba	42	56	7	9	36	57	6	7	3	3
Saskatchewan	55	82	1	13	26	50	4	6	1	1
Alberta	70	103	3	13	57	111	3	15	0	1
British Columbia	233	333	0	10	174	252	4	10	1	1
Yukon	10	19	0	0	15	15	0	0	0	0
Northwest Territories	24	42	0	1	20	30	0	0	10	17
Canada	620	977	121	239	646	989	207	337	21	45

Notes: (1) Includes originating stations and rebroadcasters.
(2) Excludes one television station which is classified as multilingual (1976).
(3) Excludes one television which is classified as multilingual (1982).

Sources: Perspective Canada II, Tables 13.13 and 13.14. Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, 1981-82 Annual Report, Table 16.

We do have information on the language distribution of radio and television stations for 1976 and 1982. See Table 4.9.

While the table does not separate main stations from rebroadcasting stations, comparable evidence collected by F.F.H.Q. suggests that virtually all of the French stations outside Quebec, New Brunswick and Ontario are rebroadcasting stations (1978:45). With regards to the official language communities, we see that the English group appears to be well served in every province (though it may well be that their choice is limited in the Quebec heartland). The French minorities in New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba would also appear to have good access to the electronic media in their own language. In addition to services generated in their own province, the French minorities in Northern New Brunswick and Eastern and Northern Ontario will be able to receive French language broadcasts originating in the province of Quebec. A similar factor operates for parts of the Anglophone minority in Quebec which can receive English language broadcast originating in Ontario or in the United States, either directly or by cable.

The French language minorities in the remaining provinces are obviously not well served by the electronic media. Many of them have no access to local programming on radio and television, while for the remainder, the choice of programmes may be restricted to "on" or "off." With the quality of many programmes, it may well be that the latter choice is preferable.

With regards to the immigrant language communities, you will note that no television stations were reported to have broadcasts in languages other than English or French. Radio broadcasting in other languages did occur, though on very few stations. Obviously, the radio stations with main broadcasting languages other than English or French were using the other "permitted" languages (Inuktitut and the Indian languages). The other stations did, however, use some of their broadcasting time for programmes in other languages. A survey of AM and FM radio stations, conducted by the CRTC in August 1972, indicated that in total 156 hours were broadcast in Italian during the sampled week, 65½ hours in French, 55½ hours in German, 43 hours in Ukrainian. The same survey reported less than one hour's programming in Flemish, Danish, Estonian, Icelandic, Maltese and Swedish (Perspective Canada, 1974, Table 13.28). These numbers are, unfortunately, difficult to interpret. The 156 hours of Italian suggest that the values indicate a total number of hours, added over all the stations included in the sample. Even so, these numbers could be produced by very few stations or by many stations. Whatever the exact meaning of the data is, it is fair to assume that radio broadcasting was more common in the languages of recently arrived immigrants (Italian, Portuguese, Greek) than for those groups who arrived in Canada in earlier periods (such as the Dutch and the Scandinavians).

In addition to radio and television, we should consider the printed media: newspapers and periodicals. Here, too, we find adequate coverage for the two official language communities, with the exception of the Francophone minorities in most of the country. See Table 4.10.

The English minority in Quebec appears to have been well served by the printed media; this appears to have continued even after the demise of the Montreal Star. Note that, in addition to the English language dailies produced in the province of Quebec, the Anglophone minority in Western Quebec can subscribe to the Ottawa Citizen, which does publish regional and local news relevant to West Quebec. For the French minorities outside Quebec, access to daily newspapers is limited: there are only two French daily newspapers published outside Quebec. Of these, Ottawa's Le Droit, with a circulation of about 50,000, has more subscribers in Quebec than in Ontario.

One way to consider the degree to which members of various language communities have access to daily news in their own language is to relate newspaper circulation figures, as in Table 4.10, to population figures by mother tongue and province of residence. The publication on culture statistics which provided newspaper circulation data also provides a brief summary of this relationship. Consider Table 4.11.

TABLE 4.10: Estimated Circulation in '000s of English-Language and French-Language Daily Newspapers by Province - Selected Years

	1970		1977		1983	
	English	French	English	French	English	French
Newfoundland	41.7	-	50.3	-	56.0	-
Prince Edward Island	28.8	-	31.9	-	34.1	-
Nova Scotia	160.2	-	173.8	-	211.5	-
New Brunswick	102.8	7.9	124.6	15.0	142.7	-
Quebec	327.6	698.5	305.7	867.4	218.8	917.3
Ontario	1,928.3	35.0	2,201.4	46.5	2,324.9	47.1
Manitoba	239.6	-	268.4	-	265.2	-
Saskatchewan	132.6	-	134.6	-	150.4	-
Alberta	332.8	-	406.0	-	571.4	-
British Columbia	536.0	-	568.4	-	605.2	-
Total	3,830.3	741.3	4,265.0	928.9	4,580.3	964.4

Sources: Canada Year Book 1970-71: 992.
Canada Year Book 1978-79: 684.
Culture Communiqué, 7 (1984): 2

The point made earlier - about the lower access of Francophones outside Quebec - is substantiated by these data. Not only is the circulation of daily newspapers, per 100 people, higher for English speakers than for French speakers in all regions, including Quebec. The circulation intensity for Anglophones in Quebec is, in fact, virtually equal to that for Anglophones in Ontario. The Francophone minorities outside Quebec show an entirely different pattern: access to French language daily newspapers outside the

province of Quebec varies from very limited in New Brunswick and Ontario to non-existent in the rest of the country.

TABLE 4.11: Daily Newspaper Circulation per 100 Population by Region and Language, 1981

	English	French	Other	Total
Atlantic	22.1	6.0	-	19.7
Quebec	32.7	17.3	-	17.9
Ontario	34.4	9.0	2.4	27.5
Prairies	28.7	-	-	22.5
British Columbia	31.0	-	0.6	25.5
Yukon	24.7	-	-	21.6
Total	30.9	15.7	1.2	23.1

Source: Statistics Canada: Culture Statistics, 1981, Catalogue 87-511.

Circulation data for printed mass media in languages other than English or French are difficult to obtain; the data which do exist are unreliable. There appear to be no daily newspapers in languages other than English or French. A number of weekly publications exists, mainly in German, Ukrainian, Italian and Dutch (RCBB, 1970:342). Total circulation of these publications tends to be quite low and their existence appears to be frequently threatened by declining subscriptions and increasing financial difficulties. Here again, printed media in immigrant languages seem to serve a need for recently arrived immigrants who have not yet learned to use the services in the majority language.

Language use and domains: a summing up

In this chapter we have taken a cursory look at patterns of language use in several domains: the work world, the school system and the media of mass communication. The available data were scanty, not always reliable and not always completely up to date. Many other data on language use exist, though they are rather scattered. We have, for example, not dealt with the high degree of the use of German (or a German dialect) by the Hutterites in the various Western Canadian colonies, nor have we dealt with the continued use of immigrant languages in various ethnic churches, voluntary organizations, choral societies and the like. While interesting points could be raised by such investigations, the general picture would not significantly be altered. Language communities tend to maintain their mother tongue most persistently in the most private of domains: the home. For immigrant language communities, such maintenance may well affect one generation only: the children of the foreign-born of other mother tongues may still learn the immigrant language, and speak it at home with their parents and other relatives, but they are likely to learn and use the majority language of their environment in the more public domains. In the shifts which have taken place, the

regional majority language has played a very powerful role. Many regional minorities even showed rather high propensities to shift to the majority language in the home. The beneficiaries of such shifts are English in every part of the country, except in the Quebec heartland, and French in the province of Quebec (mostly in the Quebec heartland, least in the Montreal Metropolitan Area). Language practices in the public domains generally reflect this domination of regional majority languages. Education and mass communication are provided practically only in the official languages of the country; even here, the Francophone minorities outside Quebec appear to be served less adequately than the Anglophones anywhere. With regards to language use at work, immigrant languages appear to be restricted to recently arrived immigrants, working as unskilled or semi-skilled labourers in relatively small work-settings in which some or all of their workmates speak the same language and, in a rather high proportion of cases, their employer or supervisor too. In the long run, continued viability of minority language communities would appear to depend largely on patterns of migration, both international and internal.

CHAPTER 5: CORRELATES OF LANGUAGE CHARACTERISTICS

At this point, we have arrived at a fairly detailed picture of language communities in Canada. We have examined the size and spatial distribution of the largest ones, have attempted to estimate the effect of various processes on their survival or decline, and have looked at the degree to which the various languages are used in some of the public domains, such as employment, education and mass communication. We have seen rather large differences between language communities, with the domination of English and, to a lesser degree, French, as public languages.

For individuals, these differences between the language communities produce additional differences in life styles and life chances. Some of these differences can easily be grasped intuitively, but not easily translated into measurable statements. On the other hand, some of the easily measured differences will be difficult to interpret. For example, the fact that many minority members are unable to watch television programmes in their own language obviously has an effect on their life style: either they watch television programmes in the majority language (which they may not speak fluently or understand perfectly) or they watch no television at all. While either of these options has an impact on their life style, it is impossible to state how serious such an impact is, or what further consequences this has for their access to social resources and to their total life chances. In contrast, it is easy to measure differences in demographic characteristics between language communities, such as age structure, or the proportion ever married, but it is virtually impossible to grasp the meaning of these differences for the individuals.

This and the following chapter form an attempt to come to grips with differences between language communities and to interpret these differences. In this chapter we deal with "correlates" of language, that is those differences which are not in any obvious ways "caused" by language characteristics. In chapter 6 we deal with "consequences" of language, that is characteristics which in a more obvious way can be seen to be affected by the individual's belonging to a particular language community. The dividing line between the two groups of characteristics is a blurred one: where we see only an association between characteristics, it may well be that there is a causal relationship which has not (yet) been revealed. In contrast, seemingly obvious causal relationships may in fact be spurious or much more complex than they appeared to be.

In this chapter, then, we will consider differences in demographic structure between various language communities, as well as differences in educational attainment.

Age structure

It is obvious that there is no direct causal relation between a person's language characteristics and his or her age. Whatever relation exists, must be of a rather complex form, in which age functions as an independent variable and "language characteristics" are the dependent variable. The degree

to which this relationship can be held to exist depends on the exact nature of the language characteristic with which we are dealing. The variable we have so far used most frequently to describe Canadian language communities was the mother tongue (defined in the censuses of population as the "language first learned in childhood and still understood"). Obviously, the age-to-mother tongue relation can only have a "causal" nature under those circumstances where individuals no longer are able to understand the language they first learned in childhood. However, this condition does not show up in the available data.

There is, however, another way to consider the relationship between age and mother tongue. We have so far dealt with the idea of language communities, their size and their spatial distribution. I have made a number of comments on the viability of various regional language minorities as a function of those aggregate characteristics. For each language community, we can also consider its age structure. This structure will, first of all, give us additional clues about the relative effects of the demograhpic processes which we discussed in chapter 2. For example, high levels of fertility - especially when combined with low propensities to language shift - will result in "young" populations (that is, populations with high percentages in the ages under 15 and low percentages in the ages over 65). Recent immigration will produce relatively high concentrations in the young adult categories (since these are the ages at which international migrants are most likely to move).

A second aspect of the age structure of a language community is that it does give us some indication of the present nature of such a community and, implicitly, about likely further developments. Consider, for example, a language community in which a large proportion of its members is under the age of 15. Such a community will wish to provide adequate schooling for its children in their mother tongue, in an effort to maintain the language through at least the next generation. For official language minorities, this would imply that the group attempts to secure public schooling in the minority language. For the immigrant language communities, such efforts may be put into part-time language classes and other mechanisms by which the children can be assisted in the retention of the mother tongue. In contrast, a language community with high proportions over the age of 65 may not have much interest in pursuing the maintenance of the mother tongue for younger generations. In general, the linguistic "quality of life" will be different for "young" and "old" language communities, regardless of size or other aggregate characteristics.

With this in mind, let us consider the data in Table 5.1.

The first way in which I suggested that we could view these data was to consider them as additional clues about earlier demographic processes. I suggested that high fertility combined with low levels of language shift would produce a "young" population. This characteristic is most obvious for the Native Indians, for which roughly 40 percent is under the age of 15. The

TABLE 5.1: Percentage Distribution of Selected Mother Tongue Categories by Age Group, Canada, 1976

	Total Population	English	French	Italian	German	Ukrainian	Dutch or Flemish	Native Indian	Greek
0-4	7.5	8.2	7.0	5.9	2.5	1.4	1.1	13.4	11.0
5-9	8.2	9.0	7.7	6.8	3.2	2.1	1.4	13.6	9.9
10-14	9.9	10.7	10.1	7.7	4.5	3.5	2.2	13.0	8.1
15-19	10.2	10.7	11.0	7.6	5.3	4.4	3.1	11.2	6.5
20-24	9.3	9.6	9.8	6.7	5.1	4.4	5.2	8.0	7.4
25-34	15.7	15.4	16.6	16.1	12.2	9.8	19.6	12.8	20.1
35-44	11.3	10.2	11.6	19.0	19.0	13.8	22.4	9.7	18.6
45-54	10.8	9.8	10.7	15.8	19.8	20.8	22.2	7.0	10.1
55-64	8.4	8.1	8.0	7.6	12.5	18.2	12.5	5.3	4.2
65+	8.7	8.4	7.5	6.6	15.8	21.6	10.2	6.1	4.0
Total	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.8	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.1	99.9

Source: 1976 Census of Canada, Bulletin 8SD.2, Table 1.

corresponding figure for the total population is only about 26 percent. Indeed, we find that birth rates for Canadian Indians have traditionally been much higher than those for the total population (see, for example, chart 12.4 in Perspective Canada, 1974). We also saw, in Tables 3.8 and 3.9, that language shift for Native Indians was low compared to the early immigrant communities. A second group with a relatively young population is the Greek mother tongue community. Twenty-nine percent of its members is below the age of fifteen. This group also has an overrepresentation in the age groups 25-34 and 35-44, where almost 39 percent of their members is concentrated (in contrast to 27 percent for the total population). Further inspection of census data shows that the main wave of immigration of Greeks took place in the period 1961-1971. It is likely that the age pattern for the Greek mother tongue population is the result of this fairly recent migration, combined with low rates of intergenerational language shift.

The only other group with higher proportions under 15 years of age is the English mother tongue community (though the overrepresentation is quite small). It is likely that this slightly higher percentage in the younger ages was caused by language shift, by children of parents with other mother tongues to English mother tongue.

At the other extreme we find the "old" immigrant groups, where much intergenerational language shift has occurred and, as a consequence, very small proportions are under 15 years of age and large proportions are 65 or over. The most extreme cases in this case are those of Ukrainian mother tongue, with 22 percent in the highest category. Correspondingly, they only have 7 percent under 15 years of age. The Dutch and German mother tongue communities show broadly comparable patterns, with overrepresentation in the higher age groups (for the Germans most pronounced for the range 35-54 and for the over 65 groups, for the Dutch primarily for the 35-54 year olds). In both cases, we noted waves of immigration after the Second World War, primarily up to 1961, coupled with high rates of language shift. Particularly the Dutch figures, with under 5 percent in the age group 0-14, reflect very high rates of intergenerational shift to English.

You may be interested to learn that the percentages under 15 for the Dutch, German and Ukrainian mother tongue groups are so extremely low that methods for the estimation of fertility yield impossible results. Bogue and Palmore (1964) developed techniques for the estimation of various measures of fertility on the basis of "indirect" indicators, such as the age structure of the population. Some of these estimation formulas are based on the percentages 0-4, 5-9 or 0-14 years of age. They give negative estimates of crude birth rates for these mother tongue communities (something not even possible if all the children born in them had English as mother tongue).

The other way to look at these age structures is to consider them as "clues" to the language environment for its members. Consider, for example, the Italian and German language communities. They were, in 1976, of approximately the same overall size. As you can see, however, the Italians had

roughly twice the proportion of young persons (under 15) as did the Germans (about 20 percent versus about 10 percent), while the Germans had more than twice the proportion of old persons (65 or over) than the Italians had. That kind of difference is likely to affect demand for such age-related "services" and organizations as part-time language classes, soccer clubs, community newspapers and the like. On the basis of these figures it would seem that, ceteris paribus, the Italian language community would have a larger number of such organizations than the German community.

This same pattern was found for the mother tongue data in 1971. If we collapse the age categories for the sake of convenience, we obtain the data in Table 5.2. Aside for the fact that all groups "aged" a little in the intervening five years (that is shown most clearly in the increasing proportions 65 and over), the same kind of description could be given to the data for 1971 as for those in 1976.

TABLE 5.2: Percentage Distribution of Selected Mother Tongue Categories by Broad Age-Groups, Canada, 1971

	0-14	15-44	45-64	65+	Total
Total Population	29.6	43.7	18.7	8.1	100.1
English	31.8	42.2	17.9	8.1	100.0
French	29.8	45.9	17.6	6.6	99.9
Italian	27.1	50.6	17.4	4.9	100.0
German	14.6	46.3	26.8	12.3	100.0
Ukrainian	10.8	36.7	35.8	16.7	100.0
Chinese	27.3	49.8	13.5	9.5	100.1
Japanese	12.1	45.9	25.9	16.2	100.0
Dutch	9.3	58.2	26.2	6.3	100.0
Indian and Eskimo	42.9	40.0	11.8	5.3	100.0
Polish	9.8	34.6	39.4	16.2	100.0
Greek	28.5	57.0	11.0	3.5	100.0

Source: 1971 Census of Canada, Bulletin 1.4-5, Table 10.

Some of the patterns became more pronounced in 1976 than they were in 1971. For example, the groups with extremely low proportions under 15 years of age (Dutch, German and Ukrainian) were somewhat closer to the overall average in 1971 (though all of them were far below that value). An interesting group is the Greek one, where the proportion under 15 increased, from 28.5 percent in 1971 to 29.1 percent in 1976. It is likely that 1976 was the first census in which the newly formed families of the recent immigrants (most of whom arrived between 1951 and 1971) made an impact on the distribution by age.

If the clues to language shift, which we took from the data in Tables 5.1 and 5.2, make sense, we should be able to use this approach also

to consider the provincial official language minorities. Moreover, such data may tell us a little more about the viability of such minorities in future years. Table 5.3 gives the data on the age-structure for the French and English language communities, by province for 1976.

We see, indeed, that all of the provincial minorities had lower proportions of their members in the youngest age-group than did the corresponding majorities. The difference was smallest for Quebec, as we would expect on the basis of earlier analyses. Not only did the English language community in Quebec appear to be resistant to language losses, but it also appeared to benefit from shifts out of other mother tongues. The only other province where the difference is quite small is New Brunswick, where a higher concentration of Francophones for the age-group 10-14 almost offsets lower concentrations for ages 0-9. It is, once more, obvious that the Francophone minorities in the Western provinces and the Northern Territories have lost considerable proportions of their children through language shift to English mother tongue. Recall that fertility for Francophone women was generally somewhat higher than it was for their Anglophone counterparts, something not evident in the percentages below 5 years of age for these populations. To get an overall view of the differences in age structures, you might consider the indices of dissimilarity, which vary between low values of 2.6 for New Brunswick, 4.9 for Quebec and 5.9 for Ontario and high values of over 20 for Saskatchewan, British Columbia and the Northwest Territories.

When we repeat the calculations for 1981, we obtain the values in Table 5.4.

We see, in general, the aging of the populations (the percentage under 15 years of age declines for both groups in all provinces; the percentage 65 years and over increases virtually everywhere). We also note the generally "older" age structure for the French mother tongue communities, except in the province of Quebec (where, as we noted, French may have gained from language shift in the younger ages in particular). It is only in New Brunswick that the two language communities have very similar age structures, with an index of dissimilarity of 3.0 (only a slight change from 1976). Other provinces with low indices of dissimilarity are Quebec (6.0) and Ontario (8.0), in both cases slight increases over 1976 as well. At the high end, we find dissimilarity indices over 20 for Newfoundland (20.2). Saskatchewan (25.2), British Columbia (22.2) and the Northern Territories (28.8 and 27.2). In these provinces, the age-structure of the French minorities is particularly unfavourable. It is worth noting that in all provinces except Alberta the indices of dissimilarity increased between 1976 and 1981; even in this province, the decline was rather minimal. If we assume that differences in fertility between the English and French communities were rather slight during this period, the data in Tables 5.3 and 5.4 indicate - again - strong and increasing language shift for the Francophone minorities in Newfoundland, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and the Northern Territories. Moreover, Alberta's French mother tongue community appears to be in a similar position, since the wave of internal migration during the 1970's appears to have been a temporary phenomenon.

TABLE 5-3: Percentage Distribution by Age Group for Population of English and French Mother Tongue by Province, Canada, 1976

	Newfoundland		Prince Edward Island		Nova Scotia		New Brunswick		Quebec		Ontario	
	English	French	English	French	English	French	English	French	English	French	English	French
0-14	33.8	20.9	28.6	21.2	27.7	17.4	28.6	28.5	24.5	25.2	27.1	22.4
15-19	11.3	7.6	10.9	11.0	10.7	8.4	10.6	11.7	9.8	11.1	10.5	10.2
20-24	9.4	9.3	8.5	7.9	9.1	8.7	9.1	10.0	8.8	9.9	9.4	9.1
25-34	14.6	23.2	13.9	11.8	14.7	15.5	14.4	15.4	15.6	16.7	15.4	16.5
35-44	9.3	14.5	9.7	11.2	10.1	11.6	9.8	9.8	10.8	11.5	10.5	12.9
45-54	8.1	10.3	8.8	10.2	9.5	11.8	9.4	9.1	11.0	10.6	10.3	12.1
55-64	7.0	7.3	8.6	10.6	8.8	12.4	8.6	7.5	9.5	7.8	8.2	8.8
65+	6.5	7.1	10.9	16.0	9.4	14.2	9.4	8.0	10.0	7.2	8.6	8.0
Total	100.0	100.2	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 5-3: Percentage Distribution by Age Group for Population of English and French Mother Tongue by Province, Canada, 1976 (Continued)

	Manitoba		Saskatchewan		Alberta		British Columbia		Yukon		Northwest Territories	
	English	French	English	French	English	French	English	French	English	French	English	French
0-14	29.3	20.1	30.6	14.9	30.4	16.6	26.5	10.4	31.8	14.3	37.5	12.8
15-19	10.8	9.7	11.8	8.8	11.5	8.7	10.5	6.1	10.6	6.7	10.7	5.9
20-24	10.1	8.8	9.9	7.7	10.9	10.0	9.4	8.4	11.2	11.4	12.0	13.7
25-34	15.3	14.9	13.5	12.8	16.3	17.9	16.0	19.6	21.3	29.5	20.6	24.2
35-44	9.2	12.3	9.0	12.8	10.1	14.4	10.2	16.1	11.1	17.1	9.7	17.4
45-54	9.0	12.2	9.1	14.1	8.7	12.5	9.9	16.0	7.9	11.4	5.7	11.0
55-64	8.0	10.3	8.0	13.1	6.4	9.6	8.7	11.7	4.1	6.7	2.7	9.6
65+	8.4	11.6	8.0	15.9	5.7	10.2	8.8	11.8	2.0	2.9	1.1	5.0
Total	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.6

Source: 1976 Census of Canada, Bulletin 8SD.2, Table 1.

TABLE 5-4: Percentage Distribution by Age Group for Population of English and French Mother Tongue by Province, Canada, 1981

	Newfoundland		Prince Edward Island		Nova Scotia		New Brunswick		Quebec		Ontario	
	English	French	English	French	English	French	English	French	English	French	English	French
0-14	29.8	16.0	25.8	14.5	24.2	13.3	25.5	25.0	20.9	22.4	24.5	18.1
15-19	11.2	5.8	10.8	9.0	10.4	7.5	10.4	10.6	10.0	9.8	10.3	9.2
20-24	9.1	11.9	8.8	8.7	9.4	9.3	9.2	9.7	9.2	10.4	9.8	9.5
25-34	16.7	23.3	15.6	14.1	16.5	17.2	16.2	18.1	16.2	18.1	17.0	17.8
35-44	10.8	18.0	10.8	12.3	11.3	13.5	10.9	11.4	11.6	13.0	11.5	14.4
45-54	8.1	12.8	9.0	9.9	9.2	11.7	8.9	8.8	10.3	10.3	9.5	12.5
55-64	7.1	5.4	8.4	11.1	8.9	12.7	8.8	8.0	10.4	8.4	8.6	9.8
65+	7.3	7.1	11.0	20.3	10.2	15.0	10.1	8.5	11.4	7.5	8.9	8.7
Total	100.1	100.3	100.2	99.9	100.1	100.2	100.0	99.7	100.0	99.9	100.1	100.0

TABLE 5-4: Percentage Distribution by Age Group for Population of English and French Mother Tongue by Province, Canada, 1981 (Continued)

	Manitoba		Saskatchewan		Alberta		British Columbia		Yukon		Northwest Territories	
	English	French	English	French	English	French	English	French	English	French	English	French
0-14	27.5	15.5	28.7	10.8	27.5	13.7	24.1	8.5	28.9	8.6	35.3	12.2
15-19	10.7	8.7	11.2	6.8	10.6	7.5	9.6	4.6	10.3	1.9	11.0	6.5
20-24	10.3	9.5	10.4	7.9	12.8	14.5	9.8	8.2	10.9	16.2	11.5	11.8
25-34	17.0	16.9	16.8	16.5	20.1	23.7	18.3	21.9	23.8	32.4	23.9	26.8
35-44	10.3	13.7	9.7	12.9	10.8	14.7	11.7	17.7	12.7	19.0	10.4	18.3
45-54	7.9	12.0	7.8	13.8	7.4	10.6	8.6	15.0	6.8	10.5	5.3	10.6
55-64	7.8	11.1	7.6	13.8	5.8	7.8	8.6	12.6	4.3	6.7	2.5	7.7
65+	8.6	12.6	7.8	17.6	5.0	7.6	9.2	11.4	2.2	4.8	1.0	6.1
Total	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.1	99.9	99.9	99.9	100.1	100.9	100.0

Source: 1981 Census of Canada, Catalogue 92-910, Table 3.

Educational attainment

The second characteristic which we might consider as a "correlate" of language is educational attainment. The dividing line between "correlate" and "consequence" is already blurred for this characteristic. It is obviously not the case that belonging to a particular language community has any bearing on one's intelligence or aptitudes for formal education. It is, however, the case that schooling is not available to all levels, in all provinces, in both English and French, let alone in any other language. I have already argued that attending school in a language other than one's mother tongue may put the pupil at a disadvantage, since it is likely that such pupils use a restricted code in their second language. For members of minority groups, choices about educational careers may therefore involve extra costs: either they may have to compete with majority members in schools in which the language of instruction is the majority language, or they have to obtain higher levels of education farther away from home. Given these choices, the result may well be that educational attainment is lower for minority members than for the rest of the population. Let us begin by considering the overall distribution in Table 5.5, pertaining to 1971.

It should not surprise us that persons of English mother tongue have the highest level of educational attainment. Members of this group have the lowest proportion with only elementary schooling, the highest percentage with at least some university education and almost the highest proportion with other post-secondary education. Given the earlier discussions about the availability of schooling for Anglophones, it would appear that the members of this language community have indeed used the opportunities offered to them.

If we consider the proportions, for each of the language communities, with elementary school or less, we find at the lower end the Northern and Western European immigrant groups: the Dutch, Scandinavians and Germans. Following these groups are the French and the Ukrainians. Two most recent immigrant groups, the Greeks and the Italians, are next, while we finally, at the lowest end, find the Inuit and the Native Indians, of whom about 80 percent of the population 15 years and over had no more than an elementary school education. The same ordering (though obviously inverted if we look at percentages) is shown at the upper end of the educational attainment range. While almost 21 percent of the Anglophones had at least some post-secondary education, less than 10 percent of the Greeks and Italians did, and only a little over 2 percent of the Native people. Of the other groups, only the Dutch approached the educational attainment of the English mother tongue community.

You should realize that the data in Table 5.5 should be viewed with some caution. We have already seen that many regional minorities undergo relatively intensive language shift, primarily towards English. There is evidence that, for some of these people, this shift has run to its logical

conclusion, that is that the individual reports English as mother tongue (Henripin, 1974). Thus, the English mother tongue community may well contain persons who started out with a different language as mother tongue. It would be reasonable to guess that it is the most successful individuals (in terms of social status, educational attainment and income) who are most likely to have shifted to English. Thus, the data on educational attainment may be slightly inflated for the English and, conversely, deflated for several of the other categories.

TABLE 5.5: Proportion of Population 15 Years and Over Not Attending School Full-Time, Showing Levels of Schooling, Selected Mother Tongue Groups, Canada, 1971

	Elementary	Secondary	Post-Secondary Non-University	Post-Secondary University
English	26.7	52.4	9.5	11.4
French	49.5	37.4	5.9	7.2
German	47.4	36.2	8.8	7.5
Italian	74.2	20.5	2.0	3.2
Ukrainian	55.2	33.0	5.0	6.7
Dutch	37.9	41.5	11.7	8.8
Indian and Eskimo	79.9	17.9	0.9	1.2
Scandinavian(1)	45.8	38.9	7.6	7.7
Greek	63.7	27.0	3.4	5.9
Total	37.2	45.0	7.9	9.8

Note (1): Includes Danish, Icelandic, Norwegian and Swedish.

Source: Tetlock and Mori (1977): 36 (Table 11).

Another factor which confounds the patterns in Table 5.5 is that large proportions of the immigrant mother tongue communities were born outside Canada and received their formal education in their country of birth. The proportions born outside Canada are high for all "other" mother tongue communities (for example, 68 percent of those of Scandinavian mother tongues were born outside Canada, 72 percent of the Dutch, 70 percent of the Italians). In contrast, 12 percent of the English mother tongue community was foreign born, 2 percent of the French and 1 percent of the Native people (1971 Census of Canada, Bulletin 1.4-II, Table 3.1). Unfortunately, we do not have the tabulations necessary to evaluate the effects of nativity on educational attainment. We can approach the analysis, however, on the basis of an unpublished tabulation which classified educational attainment for selected ethnic origin categories by mother tongue and period of immigration. Since the categories used in that table are not strictly comparable with those of Table 5.5, I have restricted the comparison to the percentage which had received at least some university education. The data are summarized in Table 5.6.

TABLE 5.6: Percentage with at least some University Education for Selected Ethnic Origin Categories, by Nativity and Mother Tongue, Persons 5 Years of Age and Older, Canada, 1971

Canadian Born	English Mother Tongue	French Mother Tongue	Ethnic Mother Tongue	Total
British Isles	9.0	7.4	*	9.0
French	5.9	5.6	*	5.6
German	7.5	8.4	4.8	6.9
Italian	6.7	6.3	1.9	4.8
Ukrainian	8.1	5.7	8.1	8.1
Foreign Born				
British Isles	12.5	13.8	*	12.5
French	16.2	15.8	*	15.9
German	20.4	14.4	8.7	10.6
Italian	11.9	8.2	3.6	4.1
Ukrainian	7.7	10.0	6.3	6.6
Total				
British Isles	9.5	7.6	*	9.4
French	6.2	5.8	*	5.8
German	8.4	8.9	7.0	7.9
Italian	7.4	5.6	3.2	4.4
Ukrainian	8.1	6.0	7.5	7.8

Source: 1971 Census of Canada, unpublished table DC16399 C.D.

Many observations can be made on the basis of the data in this table. If we compare the percentages for the foreign-born with those for the Canadian-born, we note the selectivity of international migration: with the exception of the Italians and the Ukrainians, those born outside Canada had higher proportions with at least some university education than their Canadian-born counterparts. The contrast is especially marked for those of French ethnic origin, where the foreign-born showed the highest percentage with university education of all the ethnic groups.

The second point to be noted is that, for all the ethnic origin categories in Table 5.6, having English mother tongue is associated with a higher probability of having at least some university education. This seems to apply to those born in Canada as well as those born outside. It may indeed be the case that this reflects mother tongue mobility (which was expected to be associated with educational achievement).

Lastly, we should return to the reason for which Table 5.6 was constructed; the potential contamination of the data in Table 5.5 due to the foreign-born component. While the comparability between Tables 5.5 and 5.6 is less than perfect, it seems reasonable to maintain that the contamination, though indeed observable, does not make the patterns in Table 5.5 spurious. For the Canadian-born in Table 5.6, having English mother tongue is positively associated with the probability of having some university education; conversely, having Italian mother tongue, or French, or German, seems to be negatively associated.

The contrast between the French and English communities, with respect to educational attainment, should be pursued a little further. Recall from Table 5.6 that the contrast does not disappear when we control for nativity: for those born in Canada, the difference is several percentage points. It may be that part of the cause for this pattern is the unique structure of Quebec's educational system (in particular, the Roman Catholic system before the reorganization in the early '60s). See R.C.B.B. 1968, chapters 2 and 4, for detailed discussions.

For 1981, we get essentially the same picture. Although Table 5.7 is not strictly comparable with Table 5.5, we again see those of English mother tongue having higher levels of education than the remainder of the population (note that Table 5.7 includes persons who are still attending school, while Table 5.5 does not).

TABLE 5.7: Percentage Distribution of Population 15 Years and Over by Mother Tongue and Highest Level of Schooling, Canada, 1981

	Elementary or Secondary Only	Other Non-University Education Only	University Education Without Degree	University Education With Degree
English	61.7	20.4	9.1	8.7
French	69.0	19.3	5.7	6.1
Chinese	58.0	15.1	10.9	16.2
German	62.4	24.8	6.6	6.2
Greek	77.7	12.6	5.7	4.0
Native Languages	86.1	9.5	3.5	0.9
Italian	79.4	12.5	4.4	3.7
Netherlandic	55.9	29.6	7.3	7.2
Polish	65.8	16.8	7.9	9.4
Portuguese	86.8	8.9	2.9	1.3
Ukrainian	73.1	14.5	5.9	6.5

Source: 1981 Census of Canada, unpublished table SDC 81824.

Unusually high levels of university education are also shown by those of Chinese mother tongue. This group is furthermore remarkable by the fact that almost twice as many have a university education as another post-secondary education. In some contrast, those of German and Netherlandic mother tongues seem to have a much stronger preference for non-university education: roughly twice as many persons in these groups have a non-university education as have a university education. At the lowest end of the educational attainment scale we see the Amerindians and the Inuit, of whom 4.4 percent have a university education, and the Portuguese with 4.2 percent.

An interesting relation can be found between these educational figures and the data on language shift which we analyzed in chapter 3. If we ignore, for the time being, the Chinese and Poles, we find that there is a statistical relation between the percentage with a university education (the sum of the two columns on the right-hand side of Table 5.7) and the proportion of the language community shifting to English home language. It is (% university education) = $\frac{(\%\ \text{shift})}{6} + 1.2$. This equation fits quite well for all mother tongue groups except the Chinese and the Poles, for which the percentage with a university education is considerably higher than that predicted by the equation.

A similar equation may be found which relates the percentage with elementary or secondary schooling to the percentage shifting to English: (% elementary or secondary) = $98 - \frac{(\%\ \text{shift})}{2}$. This equation produces a good fit for all groups except the Chinese (of whom fewer than expected had only an elementary or secondary education).

While it is rather risky to link these equations to any causal theories about educational attainment, they do produce an interesting validation of the idea, expressed earlier in this book, that there is a relation between the use of English and one's life chances in Canada. There is obviously a statistical association between using English at home and higher educational achievement. On the one hand, it is possible that a good command of English precedes the educational career, so that those who use English most often at home (independent variable) are likely to attain a better level of education than those who do not. Alternatively, it may be that a better knowledge of English is a consequence of post-secondary education, so that those with more education show a greater propensity to shift to English at home than those with less education. Unfortunately, the available data do not allow us to decide between these two possible explanations.

With regard to the differences in educational performance of students of French and English mother tongue, language shift is not likely to play much of a role. The great majority of these people received their education in their mother tongue, with the possible exception of the Francophone minorities outside Quebec and, perhaps, New Brunswick. With regards to the French mother tongue community in Ontario,we have some data which show that, within the same school system, Francophone students were less successful than

their Anglophone counterparts. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism used a study on educational attainment in Ontario, where data were collected beginning in 1959. This study (The Carnegie Study of Identification and Utilization of Talent in High School) pertained to all students who entered grade IX in Ontario in 1959. These students were studied for the next six years. They are grouped by language, based on the language used most often in the home; there were 71,819 students from homes in which English was the main language; 4,850 from French homes, and 5,831 from homes with "other" main languages (the French students were probably slightly underrepresented in comparison with the other two categories; this underrepresentation could be attributable to either some degree of language shift, from French mother tongue to English home language, or lower proportions in this age-group going to school. The available data do not enable us to decide which one of these explanations is the correct one).

The findings of the Carnegie study present a gloomy picture of the educational progress of Francophone students in Ontario in the period 1959-1965. Consider Table 5.8.

TABLE 5.8: Grade Retention Rates for Ontario Students Entering Grade 9 in 1959, by Language Spoken

	French		English		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grade 9	4,850	100.0	71,819	100.0	5,831	100.0	82,500	100.0
Grade 10	2,980	61.4	51,959	72.3	4,543	77.9	59,482	72.1
Grade 11	1,851	38.2	37,361	52.0	3,497	60.0	42,709	51.8
Grade 12	1,281	26.4	29,824	41.5	2,945	50.5	34,050	41.3
Grade 13	429	8.8	17,017	23.7	1,740	29.8	19,186	23.3
Graduates	155	3.2	9,465	13.2	987	16.9	10,607	12.9

Source: R.C.B.B., 1968:311.

It is clear that students from French-speaking homes performed considerably less well in the Ontario school system than their counterparts from homes where English or other languages were spoken most often. A reworking of the figures in Table 5.8 indicates that, at the end of each grade, the proportion continuing to the next grade is lower for Francophone students than for those in the other two categories. On the other hand, the students from "other" language environments have slightly higher proportions continuing from one grade to the next than do Anglophone students. The members of the Royal Commission paid considerable attention to these contrasting educational careers and considered several explanations, most of which were either discarded or could not be tested because of lack of required data. Socio-economic factors and urbanization appeared to have played a role, but not strong enough to explain the difference. Attitudes towards schooling and career expectations also differ insufficiently strongly to explain the pattern. One factor which may have played a role is reflected in considerably

lower scores by Francophone students on academic aptitude tests and on measures of achievement in English and mathematics (R.C.B.B., 1968:88-89). The report rightly argues that basic aptitudes should not be distributed differently across the three categories of students. Thus, the explanation of the lower performance on standardized aptitude tests by Francophone students must be found in other factors (1968:81). The authors of the report rejected the "language barrier" as an explanation for the lower test scores of Francophones.

They may have been a little too fast in this rejection. Let us reconsider some of the points I made in chapter 1. I suggested there that any persons who acquire a second language will learn to use a restricted code in that language. We have seen the argument, put forth by Bernstein, that educational systems generally put emphasis on the elaborated code, and that students who are only able to use restricted codes will be disadvantaged with regards to their academic progress. Now consider the case of the Franco-Ontarians. First of all, we have seen that a significant proportion of them will be unable to obtain secondary schooling entirely in French. Since English is only a second language for them, they may not perform as well as fellow students who use a more elaborated English code. There is, however, more to this argument. Scandinavian linguists in particular have used a concept of "semilingualism," that is the condition in which "a speaker does not know any language properly at the same level as monolingual native speakers" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1978:222-223). Linguistic researchers found that many immigrant and guestworker minorities - and in particular the children in such language communities - often are "doubly semilingual," i.e., they are unable to use an elaborated code in either of the two languages involved. It may well be that those Franco-Ontarian high school students who did receive their schooling in French were using restricted codes in both French and English. One result of that condition could be that they performed less well on academic aptitude tests even if the instructions and the test items were translated into French. Another result could be that their educational attainment was not as high as that for students who could function in their mother tongue at the elaborated end of the range of possible codes. Keep in mind that, although they may have been able (even required) to use French as the language of instruction in the school, the other domains (except the home and possibly the church) would require them to use English. Their exposure to French outside the school system may well have been to a restricted variety.

Some of the research by Canadian linguists may be pertinent here. Mougeon et al. (1982) conducted a large study on the use of French by children in French language schools in Ontario. Their findings support the notion that minority members tend to use restricted versions of their language. They measured among other factors the degree to which respondent failed to use the reflexive pronoun (by saying, for example, "ce matin j'ai oublié de lever"). Their samples were subdivided by school grade (2, 5, 9 and 12) and by the degree to which the children used French with their

parents, and pertain to the communities of Hawkesbury, Cornwall, North Bay and Pembroke. One aspect of their findings is given in Table 5.9.

TABLE 5.9: Percentages Failing to use the Reflexive Pronoun, by Grade in School and Main Language used with Parents, for Four Ontario Communities, 1979

	Hawkesbury	Cornwall		North Bay		Pembroke	
	High	French	English	French	English	French	English
2	4	10	22	37	64	36	65
5	4	1	20	4	28	14	67
9	0	3	12	5	17	26	30
12	0	0	6	0	11	11	25
Total	1	8		20		36	

Source: Mougeon et al., 1982:50 (Table 10).

While it is not the case that such sample data provide overwhelming evidence for the use of restricted codes, data such as those reported in Table 5.9 do support the notion. It is likely that minority members would show other characteristics of restricted codes, more than would be expected for majority speakers of the same language (e.g., Francophones in Quebec). Mougeon et al. do, in fact, cite examples of other research findings which lead one to believe that the above inference is correct. Before we move on, I would like to comment on part of Mougeon's interpretation. The argument is made that Ontario Francophones in minority settings appear to learn the proper use of the reflexive pronoun at a later age than do those who are able to use their mother tongue more extensively (1982:89) "... nous avons constaté que les élèves qui communiquent surtout ou toujours en français tendaient à acquérir l'emploi du pronom réfléchi en début de scolarité alors que les élèves qui communiquent toujours ou surtout en anglais manifestent un retard considérable dans cette acquisition." It may well be that who did acquire the use of the reflexive pronoun early in their schooling are more likely to continue their secondary schooling than those who did not. Such interpretation is consistent with the pattern of grade retention reported by the Carnegie study.

In all fairness, we should not consider the inferred condition of "semi-lingualism" to be the only explanation for the lower educational attainment levels of the Francophone minority. The Royal Commission report suggests that the Ontario school system presented French mother tongue parents with a "value conflict" in which they had to choose between the values of education (manifested by an institution designed and controlled by an English language majority) and of cultural survival (1968:92-93). Porter and his associates found, in a more recent survey of the educational aspirations of Ontario high school students, that the parents of Francophone students had lower expectations for the schooling of their children than did parents of Anglophone

students. Their interpretation suggests that this dfference may be due to differences in values as well as to linguistic patterns: "While French language instruction is increasingly available, in some cases the administration of the secondary school is still in English which presents a further barrier to the French speaking parent." (Porter et al., 1977:160). Rocher, finally, reiterates the "value conflict" hypothesis to explain the lower educational attainment of Francophones outside Quebec (1975:149-153).

CHAPTER 6: CONSEQUENCES OF LANGUAGE CHARACTERISTICS

Introduction

In chapter 5 we dealt with some of the social characteristics which we could see as being correlated with language characteristics of an individual. We looked at the age structure of various language communities and at the educational attainment of their members. It was clear that these social characteristics were linked with language, in a relationship which was "causal" only in a fairly complex way. Obviously, "French mother tongue" can not be held to be a "cause" of lower education attainment: there is nothing inherent in the language which would lead any of its speakers to have a lower aptitude for education. Obviously, a specification of the causal mechanism by which this type of association can be explained requires additional links - through consideration of language rights, the structure of the educational system, the social environment in which the minority has to function, the patterns of language use and similar aggregate and contextual characteristics. We did set up some of these more complex explanations, despite the fact that firm evidence to support them is not available.

In this chapter, we will see the other side of the coin, so to speak. We will deal with social characteristics which are generally regarded as "consequences" of the language characteristics of individuals: occupational attainment and income. Such "consequences" are generally linked to the structure of society, or the organization of a particular industry. This type of explanation has a long history in Canadian social science. Everett Hughes in his pioneering study of occupational patterns in "Cantonville," documented the strong overrepresentation of Anglophones among the staff of a local textile mill, as well as among the foremen. This overrepresentation was combined with an underrepresentation among the mill's rank and file. This pattern is attributed to such factors as company ownership, educational attainment of employees, the structure of education for French Canadians and the French Canadian value system (Hughes, 1943).

Hughes' findings were certainly not unique; the patterns of occupational selection he found were neither restricted to Quebec, nor did they end with the Second World War. The many studies done for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism documented the inferior socio-economic position of Francophones relative to Anglophones, in particular with regards to income, occupational prestige and ownership of industry (R.C.B.B., 1969). In their review of these findings, the authors of the Royal Commissions's report cited several of the "structural" explanations which had been advanced by earlier researchers (1969:6-7), but refrained from expressing a preference for any one of the explanations. This, incidentally, suggests that their recommendations cannot have been based on a single explanation and therefore may either have had no effect or even a negative one on the eradication of linguistic differences in socio-economic status. Several more recent studies lead one to believe that little has been achieved nationally to reduce these differences significantly.

This situation does not make our life easy. We will see, in the sections which follow, the marked differences in occupation, income and general socio-economic status between Francophones and Anglophones. (We will

also consider those of other language communities, but they do not play as important a role in our analysis as the other two groups do). We have already seen, in the preceding chapter, that there are comparable differences in educational attainment between Francophones and Anglophones. One of our tasks will be to establish whether the substantial socio-economic differences can be attributed to such differences in education (we do know that there have traditionally been strong correlations between an individual's level of education and his eventual socio-economic status), or whether language characteristics of individuals have an effect in addition to, or net of, the prior educational effects.

Occupational distribution

Studies which illustrate the differences in occupational distribution between various ethnic groups in Canada have a long history. I already mentioned Everett Hughes' study of "French Canada in Transition" which pertains to the 1930's. In this same approach fits the work by John Porter, who amply documented the association between British ethnic origin (especially when contrasted with French ethnic origin) and such socio-economic indicators as membership in Canada's economic elite (1956, 1957) and occupational prestige (1965). It is somewhat unfortunate that these earlier studies were based on ethnic origin, rather than on more clearly linguistic categories, since strict comparability with more recent studies does not exist. Our main consolation is that, until the late 1940's, ethnic origin was highly correlated with mother tongue. This correlation began to decline in the 1950's, to the point where (in the early 1980's) ethnic origin only has a strong association with language characteristics for recently arrived immigrant groups.

The 1961 census provides a distribution of the male labour force by ethnic origin and broad occupational categories. See Table 6.1. The occupational categories are ordered approximately in descending order of socio-economic status. That is, persons with high socio-economic status are generally found in the categories of "Professional, Technical and Managerial," while those with low status are generally found in "Craftsmen, Production Workers and Labourers." Given this rough indication, we note the distinctly higher occupational status for men of British ethnic origin than for men of virtually all other ethnic categories, with the exception of the Jewish ethnic group. Over 21 percent of the men of British ethnic origin were classified in the first two occupational categories, in contrast to 13.5 percent for the French, 9.4 percent for the Italians but over half of the men of Jewish ethnic origin. You should realize that the difference between British ethnic origin and Jewish ethnic origin is primarily one of religion rather than of language: the great majority of persons of Jewish ethnic origin had English as mother tongue, but was of Jewish religion. In contrast, no other ethnic group contained any members who reported being Jewish by religious affiliation.

TABLE 6.1: Percentage Distribution of the Male Labour Force, by Ethnic Origin and Occupational Group, Canada, 1961

	British	French	German	Italian	Jewish	Ukrainian	Other	Total
Professional and Technical	9.3	5.9	6.1	2.8	13.7	5.8	6.9	7.6
Managerial	12.1	7.6	8.3	6.6	39.4	7.1	9.5	10.2
Clerical	8.2	6.7	5.0	3.7	6.8	5.7	5.1	6.9
Sales	6.6	5.2	4.4	3.2	14.1	3.5	4.2	5.6
Service	9.2	7.7	6.4	8.5	2.6	7.3	9.6	8.5
Transport and Communications	8.0	8.9	6.2	4.7	2.8	6.4	5.5	7.5
Craftsmen, Production Workers	25.5	31.4	32.5	43.7	15.6	29.6	29.8	28.8
Labourers	4.6	7.5	5.6	19.2	1.1	6.9	6.8	6.2
Farmers	10.8	10.8	21.0	2.7	0.5	23.0	15.8	12.2
Other Primary	3.1	5.3	2.3	2.3	0.0	2.5	4.6	3.9
Not Stated	2.6	3.0	3.0	2.6	3.4	2.2	2.2	2.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: 1961 Census of Canada, Catalogue 94-515.

The same picture is obtained if we consider the lower end of the occupational scale: of the Italians, over 60 percent were craftsmen, production workers or labourers; in contrast, only 16.7 percent of the Jewish ethnic origin category and 30.1 percent of the British group belonged in these categories. The markedly lower occupational status for the population of French ethnic origin, as well as for most of the "immigrant" ethnic categories persists at least through the 1971 population census. While the data are not strictly comparable (due to the use of different occupational categories in 1971 than in the preceding censuses), the 1971 patterns show a remarkable similarity to those found for 1971. Consider Table 6.2.

The high proportions of men of British ethnic origin in the higher status categories (Professional, Managerial, Semi-Professional and Skilled White Collar) indicate that the observation for 1961 still stands in 1971. The even more pronounced overrepresentation of Jewish males in the upper levels of the occupational status distribution also continues with little indication of a decline: almost 60 percent of them were located in the first four categories (compared with about 30 percent for the total male labour force, 16 percent for those of Italian ethnic origin and 13 percent for persons of Inuit or Native Indian ethnicity). Finally, note the relatively high occupational status of Canadian men of Asiatic origins (mostly Chinese and Japanese). The pattern noted here is consistent with the high level of educational attainment which we found in chapter 5.

There is another way to assess the relation between language and occupational status. A great deal of attention has been paid, in contemporary sociological research, to the measurement of occupational prestige. One line of analysis, followed by several Canadian researchers, is the allocation of an occupational status index which is a function of (i) the normal or typical educational qualifications of persons with a particular occupation and (ii) the average income paid to persons with that occupation. For detailed discussions of this index for Canadian data, see Blishen (1967) and Blishen and McRoberts (1976). For the 1971 census, we have a tabulation which gives means and standard deviations for this occupational status index, by ethnic origin. See Table 6.3.

Pineo and Porter point out that the differences in occupational status between ethnic groups are small. The variation within categories (indicated by the standard deviation) is relatively large. Thus, there is considerable overlap in the occupational prestige distribution between even the highest and lowest ranked groups, when we consider ethnic origin.

The difficulty with the type of analysis mentioned above is that "ethnic origin" - particularly as measured in the Canadian census - is of course a very "diluted" concept: various ethnic categories contain large proportions of Canadian-born persons, who have grown up in Canadian society, have married spouses from other ethnic groups and generally feel very little attachment, if any, to their ethnic "origins." I have used the data here primarily

TABLE 6.2: Percentage Distribution of the Male Labour Force, by Ethnic Origin and Occupational Group, Canada, 1971

	British	French	German	Italian	Jewish	Polish	Scandinavian	Ukrainian	Asian	Native	Total Male Labour Force
Professional	11.2	8.3	8.9	3.9	18.1	8.7	9.2	8.4	20.3	3.2	9.9
Management	7.6	5.1	5.2	2.0	12.0	4.3	5.7	4.9	3.3	2.9	5.9
Semi-Professional	3.1	2.6	2.4	1.5	4.8	2.6	2.6	2.1	4.9	2.8	2.8
Skilled White Collar	12.8	10.3	10.3	8.6	23.9	9.0	10.4	9.9	15.4	4.0	11.7
Skilled Blue Collar	19.9	21.7	24.8	28.7	9.1	23.5	23.6	20.7	12.4	20.9	21.2
Lower White Collar	11.2	12.4	8.3	10.3	14.5	9.5	7.6	13.5	13.3	7.0	11.1
Semi-Skilled Blue Collar	10.5	12.5	10.7	16.0	5.2	13.6	10.2	10.8	13.8	17.8	11.5
Labourer	17.5	21.4	15.1	26.5	11.6	19.6	15.2	17.0	14.2	32.2	18.6
Farmer	3.9	3.2	9.5	0.4	0.2	6.4	11.0	9.3	0.7	1.7	4.3
Farm Labourer	2.9	2.4	5.0	1.7	0.3	3.0	4.5	3.5	1.8	7.4	3.0
Total	100.6	99.9	100.2	99.6	99.7	100.2	100.0	100.1	100.1	99.9	100.0

Source: Porter, 1985:49.

156

TABLE 6.3: Mean Occupational Status by Ethnic Origin, Male Labour Force, Canada, 1971

Ethnic Origin	Mean	Standard Deviation
British	42.5	15.3
French	39.4	14.5
German	39.4	14.6
Dutch	39.0	14.6
Scandinavian	39.5	14.9
Italian	34.8	12.2
Jewish	49.9	15.6
Polish	39.0	14.2
Ukrainian	39.0	14.5
Asian	43.8	17.0
Native Indian	32.4	11.7
Total	40.7	14.9

Source: Pineo and Porter, 1985:362.

because the orientation among Canadian researchers on occupational status and mobility has primarily been towards ethnicity, rather than to language characteristics. Given the problems of validity mentioned above, it is not surprising that Pineo and Porter came to the conclusion that "... the overall relationship of ethnic status and occupational status is not great" (1985:389). They report correlations between ethnic and occupational status, for males, of .07 in the 1971 Census, and of .11 in the 1973 Canadian mobility survey, which indeed are very unimpressive as correlation coefficients go. It is rather regrettable that this type of analysis has not been applied to the data on mother tongue or home language.

Another study of the linkage between ethnic origin and occupational attainment, based on the 1971 census, helps us a little bit to sort out what is going on. Richmond and Kalbach used, as one measure of occupational achievement, the relative concentration of males from different categories in managerial occupations (which may be assumed to be in the upper end of the occupational status scale). After controlling for the effects of age and education they found that, among persons born in Canada, with two Canadian-born parents, those of British and French ethnic origin were overrepresented by 5 percent, while those of other ethnic origin were underrepresented by 18 percent (1980:354). Note that a comparatively large percentage of the Canadian-born with two Canadian-born parents is made up of Indians and Inuit, who tend to live in areas where managerial positions are relatively uncommon.

In contrast to the pattern shown for the native born of native parentage, consider immigrants who arrived in Canada during the period 1946-1960. In this group, those of British ethnic origin had an over-

representation in the managerial category of 4 percent, while those of Italian ethnic origin were underrepresented by 29 percent and all others by 27 percent (Richmond and Kalbach, 1980:354). This type of finding, while not necessarily identical with what we would have found on the basis of mother tongue, does fit in well with results mentioned earlier. It is, I think, fair to argue that members of the English language community in Canada are overrepresented in managerial occupations while others tend to be underrepresented, especially if they were born outside Canada. Keep in mind that the findings reported by Richmond and Kalbach were obtained after they controlled for differences between the various categories regarding age structure and educational attainment. It is, therefore, not possible to argue that the lower representations of those of Italian ethnic origin, for example, in the managerial category could be attributed to the fact that their educational attainment was lower than that for the English mother tongue community. Again, we can think of language use and language requirements in specific occupations as a possible explanation. If we accept the idea that persons whose mother tongue is not English are likely to use a somewhat restricted code when they do use English, and if we accept the idea that the demands of a manager's job include the regular use of an elaborated code, it becomes plausible to hypothesize that persons of other mother tongues would tend to avoid jobs in which a premium is placed on the use of elaborated codes.

The fact, incidentally, that the French ethnic origin category showed an overall underrepresentation in the upper occupational categories (including the managerial occupations), while Richmond and Kalbach showed a slight overrepresentation after controlling for age and education would suggest that the Francophones in Canada have a lower level of occupational attainment due directly to their lower level of education. That suggests, in turn, that they do not suffer (on the basis of the national data) through their lack of ability to use the elaborated code in French. The line of analysis which I suggested in chapter 5 may well pertain to the Francophone minorities outside Quebec, but we do not have the necessary data to check this out.

I already indicated that the differences in occupational attainment between the French and English in Quebec have been the subject of many empirical studies, beginning with those by Hughes (1943), followed by noteworthy studies by Brazeau (1958, 1969), Guindon (1960, 1964, 1978), Keyfitz (1963) and Elkin (1973), to name but a few. This sequence was, to a large degree, summarized by the studies conducted on behalf of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (see R.C.B.B., 1969:430-440 for short descriptions of these studies). The most recent round of studies consisted of the ones done for the Gendron Commission (1972). One of the most eloquent summaries of the occupational stratification in the province of Quebec was written by Guindon when he argued that "... historically, the native Quebecois provided the unskilled and semiskilled labour in the industrial sector. Clerical, middle and upper managerial levels in the private sector, especially in the large corporations, were and still are the domain of the English" (1978:237). The existence of this dual labour market is documented

clearly by some of the Gendron Commission's findings. See, for example, Table 6.4.

Keep in mind, in considering the data in this table, that for the total male labour force in Quebec in 1971, there were 5.3 French males for every English male. Thus, any value below 5.3 indicates a relative overrepresentation of Anglophones, while values over 5.3 indicate an overrepresentation of Francophones. The English workers are, thus, clearly overrepresented in the manufacturing industry, the public utility services, and the financial corporations. In contrast, the French speakers are overrepresented in the primary industry, the construction industry, public administration and the commercial sector.

TABLE 6.4: Number of French-Speaking Persons for each English-Speaking Person by Activity Sector and Occupational Level, Quebec, January, 1971

	Administrators and Professionals	Office Workers and Salesmen	Services, Transportation Communication Employees	Foremen and Workers
Primary Industry	2.3	10.0	12.0	18.0
Construction Industry	4.0	0.2	38.0	73.5
Public Administration	7.5	35.5	7.0	6.8
Commerce	7.2	6.9	6.8	15.1
Personal and Social Services	4.7	5.5	9.3	9.8
Manufacturing Industry	1.1	3.5	8.3	11.0
Public Utility Services	1.8	2.1	2.2	4.9
Finance	2.4	2.5	2.0	2.0

Source: Gendron Commission, 1972:114.

If we consider data in Table 6.4 by row, rather than by column, we notice generally an increase in the proportion of French speakers as we move from the higher ranked occupations (on the left-hand side of Table 6.4) to the lower ranked occupations, in support of Guindon's analysis. It is only

in the sectors of commerce and public administration that French speakers are overrepresented in the ranks of administrators and professionals.

One possible explanation for the predominance of the Anglophones in Quebec's administrative and professional positions is that the larger manufacturing establishments in the province have been disproportionately owned by the English. Smaller firms (with obviously smaller proportions of administrative and professional positions) were more likely to be owned by the French (R.C.B.B., 1969:53-60). Raynauld's study found that, in 1961, only establishments in agriculture and in the service industry were overwhelmingly owned by Francophones (R.C.B.B., 1969:55). The Gendron Commission found that the pattern had continued to 1971: its studies indicated that the Montreal head offices of large corporations hired English speakers in large proportions; there was a positive correlation between a job's salary and the probability that an Anglophone would be hired (Gendron Commission, 1972:119-120).

More recent data, analyzed by Vaillancourt, indicate that this long-established pattern has begun to disappear in the later part of the seventies. He compiled the summary found in Table 6.5

TABLE 6.5: Share of Managerial Jobs Held by Francophones, Quebec, 1967-1969

	Board of Trade (All)	Bernard et al. (All)	Lacroix and Vaillancourt (Men)
1967	62.6	-	-
1971	-	72.5	69.0
1978	-	74.8	-
1979	80.8	-	86.0

Source: Vaillancourt, 1981, Table 12.

Obviously, the measures in the three studies reported by Vaillancourt are not strictly comparable, but the contrasts between the data for 1967 and 1971 on the one hand and for 1979 on the other hand are sufficiently large that they exceed sampling variation and measurement discrepancies. Vaillancourt and Daneau reported that, during the same period, employment ads for management and engineering positions were increasingly requiring only French, or both French and English, at the expense of "English only" requirements. With regards to this level of position, then, it is fair to state that "... the increased use of French in the workplace had reduced the availability of English only jobs in Montreal and, hence, in the whole of Quebec" (Vaillancourt, 1981:17).

Occupational mobility

The preceding section has demonstrated quite clearly that, nationally, members of the English language community appear to have an advantage with regard to occupational attainment over members of the other language communities. In the province of Quebec, this advantage has been documented over long periods of time, as we saw. The obvious question arises whether this occupational advantage is due only to the higher educational attainment (which we documented in chapter 5), in part to education (and in part to other factors) or not at all to educational attainment.

There is a series of studies of occupational mobility which may help us to answer this question.

The earliest study of intergenerational mobility in Quebec was undertaken by de Jocas and Rocher - who compared the occupations of 1,405 men who married in Quebec in 1954 with those of their fathers at the time when these men were born. The data (restricted to men born in Canada, after 1925) allow a comparison of the intergenerational occupational mobility for Francophones and Anglophones. The main finding reported by de Jocas and Rocher was that the Anglophones were more likely than the Francophones to shift from manual to non-manual occupations. Moreover, Anglophones tended to move more rapidly up the occupational status hierarchy than did their Francophone counterparts. This study was updated, with a comparable research design, by Dofny and Garon-Audy, who used Quebec marriage records for 1964. The latter study found a similar pattern, though the differences in intergenerational mobility between the two language communities had declined somewhat. Explanations for the "catching up" by Francophones in Quebec are put in terms of the rather drastic changes in the structure of Quebec's economy and some "affirmative action" policies which helped Francophones to obtain higher level positions.

While these two studies documented the higher occupational attainment of Anglophones in Quebec, as well as their higher rate of upward intergenerational mobility, it is not clear whether these patterns result from their higher educational attainment, or whether other factors played a role as well. The data collected for the studies don't even allow that type of analysis. Data collected in 1973 for the Canadian National Mobility Study (CARMAC), to which I referred in chapter 4, do allow the more detailed analyses of the effects of education on occupational attainment. In a sequence of presentations, McRoberts has developed this line of analysis, contrasting Quebec Francophones with Anglophones in all of Canada, and with Anglophones in Quebec (McRoberts, 1975; McRoberts et al., 1976; McRoberts, 1985). Using currently fashionable techniques for the analysis of occupational mobility, (primarily loglinear techniques), these researchers showed that, after controlling for differences in starting positions, they could not distinguish between the "mobility regimes" for Francophones and Anglophones in the Canadian labour force. The main difference noted was that Francophones generally had a lower "rate of return" to education for the status of

their first job; such an effect appears to have been much smaller for cohorts who entered the labour force more recently.

Chan (1979), using a "vacancy competition model" to compare occupational attainments of Francophones and Anglophones in Quebec, separated both categories into "unilinguals" and "bilinguals." She showed that the returns to education were, in fact, much higher for unilingual Anglophones in Quebec than for the other three categories (i.e., bilingual Anglophones, bilingual Francophones and unilingual Francophones).

We are thus left with the not entirely firm conclusion that the lower educational attainment for Francophones may have had "direct" as well as "indirect" effects on their occupational attainment, but that in more recent years (and, therefore, in particular for persons who left the school system more recently) the only effects were the "direct" ones. That is , lower occupational attainment for Francophones is the result of lower educational achievement alone. The obvious consequence for language policy is that much of the observed difference between Francophones and Anglophones may disappear if Francophones could be convinced to stay in school longer, or, more specifically, model their educational careers more clearly on those of their Anglophone counterparts.

Labour income

It should not come as a surprise for us to find that the differences in occupational status between the Francophones and Anglophones in Quebec have resulted in noticeable income differences. As with occupational attainment, there are several studies which document the relation between an individual's language characteristics, other individual characteristics (such as levels of education, years of experience in the labour force, age) and the income derived from his labour. The earliest study was done in connection with the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Table 6.6 gives the data from the 1961 census of population, by ethnic origin and knowledge of the official languages.

Thus, we see that there was a considerable benefit (in terms of overall income) to be of British, rather than French, ethnic origin, both in Quebec and in the rest of Canada. Moreover, there was a benefit in knowing English, with or without the additional knowledge of French (the categories "French Only" obviously had lower total incomes than the corresponding other categories). This premium on the knowledge of English even held for residents of Quebec, of French as well as British ethnic origin: for both groups, the category "English Only" was associated with the highest average income, followed by the category "both."

Further investigations showed, however, that much of the higher incomes for bilingual individuals was due to the various factors associated with bilingualism (such as higher levels of education).

TABLE 6.6: Average Total Income of the Male Non-Agricultural Labour Force, by Ethnic Origin and Knowledge of Official Languages, Canada and Quebec, 1961

Ethnic Origin	Knowledge of Official Languages	Canada	Quebec
British	English Only	4,758	6,049
	French Only	2,535	2,783
	Both	6,284	5,929
	Total	4,852	5,918
French	English Only	4,017	5,775
	French Only	3,097	3,107
	Both	4,350	4,523
	Total	3,872	3,880
All Origins	English Only	4,541	5,502
	French Only	3,088	3,099
	Both	4,745	4,772
	Total	4,414	4,227

Source: R.C.B.B., 1969:21 (Table 4).

Raynauld and his group (who conducted the initial R.C.B.B. research) followed these initial findings with more detailed studies of the income disparities between men of British and French ethnic origin. When they decomposed these income differences for members of the labour force in the Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa census metropolitan areas, they obtained the data in Table 6.7, which show clearly that the major factor explaining the lower income earned by men of French ethnic origin was their lower level of educational attainment (which then led to lower levels of occupational attainment, as we already saw earlier in this chapter).

TABLE 6.7: Factors Contributing to Income Disparities between Men of British and French Ethnic Origin in the Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa Census Metropolitan Areas, 1961

	Montreal	Toronto	Ottawa
Disparity	$1,898	$1,093	$1,496
% Due to:			
Age	5.9	16.1	10.7
Industry	4.2	4.4	7.6
Schooling/Occupation	45.1	44.1	62.4
Unemployment	6.3	13.0	9.2
Total Explained	61.5	77.6	89.9
Residual Factors	38.5	22.4	10.1

Source: R.C.B.B., 1969:69,70 (Tables 25, 26).

This same line of analysis showed that bilingualism does contribute to the labour income of those of French ethnic origin, though not to those of British ethnic origin. Even in the former case, however, much of the effect of bilingualism is spurious, since the bilingual group has more education than its unilingual counterparts (1969:75).

Vaillancourt has followed up this research by more detailed analyses of the income disparities between persons of English and French mother tongue, based on the 1971 census data. His analyses deal only with income disparities in Quebec, with particular emphasis on the situation in Montreal. The main contrast is between persons of French versus English mother tongue, with both groups split into unilingual and bilingual respondents. After controlling for several other factors which are known to have an effect on labour income (such as years of education, years of experience in the labour force and the number of hours worked per week), he found that language characteristics did account for part of the observed labour income differences between the four groups (unilinguals and bilinguals, for French and English mother tongue). A summary of some of his findings is given in Table 6.8.

As we see, in 1970 there was a premium on being able to speak English, for Quebec men as well as women. The advantage was comparatively larger for males than for females. Moreover, for males there was an obvious advantage

TABLE 6.8: Net Impact of Language Skills on Labour Income, Quebec, Men and Women, 1970 and 1978

	Men		Women	
	1970	1978	1970	1978
Unilingual Anglophones	21.1	0	8.8	0
Bilingual Anglophones	26.2	7.8	7.3	0
Bilingual Francophones	17.1	4.7	7.7	7.9

Note: The percentage indicate the excess labour income of the group compared to unilingual Francophones, controlling for other skills and background variables.

Source: Vaillancourt, 1981:31

in being of English mother tongue: the "net impact" was higher for the two Anglophone groups than for the bilingual Francophone group. It may be noted that there was no comparable "mother tongue advantage" for Quebec women in 1970. It may be that the observation regarding males ties in with points made earlier about the hiring practices of Montreal companies.

By 1978, following the election of the Parti Quebecois and the language policies codified in Bill 101, the picture appears to have changed considerably. There was obviously less of a premium on the knowledge of English, both for men and for women. There was still a benefit to the knowledge of both English and French, for both sexes. The declining

importance of English is manifested in the fact that, in 1978, there was no premium to being of English mother tongue per se. Moreover, bilingual Anglophone men (i.e., those who had acquired French) gained procentually more on their uniligual counterparts than bilingual Francophones (i.e., thosed who had acquired English). Curiously, there appeared to be some benefit for Francophone females to know English. Is this the result of hiring practices of Montreal head-offices regarding secretaries? Available data do not enable us to give an explanation.

Finally, we can show that the income differences between those of French and English mother tongue are also manifest at the lower end of the income distribution. Table 6.9 gives the incidence of "low income," by province and by mother tongue of the head of the household.

TABLE 6.9: Incidence of Low Income by Mother Tongue of Family Head, Canada and Provinces, 1971

	English	French	Other	Total
Newfoundland	38.0	31.7	32.4	37.9
Prince Edward Island	28.2	38.9	31.9	29.0
Nova Scotia	23.1	29.5	29.3	23.7
New Brunswick	22.6	34.6	31.4	26.5
Quebec	14.7	22.9	23.1	21.8
Ontario	12.6	18.1	16.0	13.7
Manitoba	20.0	28.3	30.6	24.0
Saskatchewan	27.1	36.5	41.0	31.8
Alberta	17.8	26.6	27.1	20.6
British Columbia	14.7	19.7	20.6	16.0
Canada	16.5	23.1	22.3	19.2

Source: 1971 Census of Canada, Bulletin SF-3, Table 2.

The picture is, again, consistent with that given so far: almost invariably, household income for households where the head is of French mother tongue, is lower than that for households where the head is of English or other mother tongue. Keep in mind, however, that these are "gross" differences, not corrected for such factors as educational attainment, age-structure, occupation. Given the evidence from the studies of occupational attainment and of labour income, it is likely that there is no <u>direct</u> connection between mother tongue and the incidence of low household income, but that the association is due to the familiar set of intervening variables, primarily education.

Summing up: the benefits of language skills

The analyses in this chapter and the preceding one have given us some idea of the benefits of belonging to a particular language community, and of the potential payoffs to acquiring a second language. The overall story seems to be going like this: it is generally beneficial to be of English mother tongue; it is relatively disadvantageous to be of French mother tongue. The primary effect appears to be that those of English mother tongue - and, to a lesser degree, those of other mother tongues - have higher levels of educational attainment. This higher level of schooling (often associated with the acquisition of the other official language) is then translated into the attainment of occupations with higher prestige and higher income. The studies by the economists have shown that the gross differences in income between different mother tongue categories are considerably larger than the net differences, after controls for other variables were introduced.

This kind of finding is obviously important when we consider the various policies developed by the federal government for the elimination of the disadvantages accruing to the Francophone population. If it is indeed the case that the main explanation for this disadvantage lies in lower educational attainment, then policies which deal primarily with hiring and salaries are unlikely to be successful. Such policies would always be in the form of "affirmative action" or "positive discrimination," in that Francophones with less education might be preferred over others with better qualifications, or that labour income for Francophones would be higher than for others with otherwise identical characteristics. The proper policy - assuming of course that the analyses presented here are in fact correct statements of reality - would be to ensure that Francophones have the same opportunities for educational attainment as do other Canadians.

CHAPTER 7: LANGUAGE RIGHTS: THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE STATE

By now, we have almost come full circle. In the preceding chapters, I have tried to make the point that language is a social phenomenon which may be studied at the level of individuals and at the level of social groups, communities or total societies. I also asserted that, in a sociology of language, the "macro-sociological" aspects of language should not be ignored. Throughout the quantitative analyses of these earlier chapters, I attempted to demonstrate various linkages between societal characteristics, language and individual characteristics, for example by illustrating how a person's mother tongue is associated with his or her educational attainment, given what we found earlier about language use in the educational systems of the country.

These "institutional" language practices have not evolved randomly, nor are they totally a function of some form of linguistic "supply and demand." In many societies, language use in public domains is subject to government regulations and legislation. Such regulations are, of course, needed with regards to communication between governments and individuals (imagine the chaos which could develop if all citizens were allowed to communicate with government departments in the language of their choice). For similar reasons, language use is generally regulated for other public or para-governmental organizations, such as the school system and the health care system. A cursory inspection of language rights in other bilingual or multilingual societies around the world will yield the observation that most nation-states specify which language(s) may be used in particular situations or domains, but the amount of freedom permitted shows an enormous variation across societies. Laponce gives many details on language rights and practices around the world (1984: 87-129, 157-179, 206-209).

In current terminology, we can distinguish two forms of public language regulation: language corpus planning and language status planning, following the terms used by Kloss (1969). The former deals with the establishment of a proper vocabulary for a particular language, usually with the aim of preventing the intrusion of elements from other languages into the "standard language" of the nation or of the region (if you take the long historical view, you will quickly realize that such purism is rather arbitrary: I doubt that even the most "pure" of languages can be shown to be totally free of loan words from other languages, be it Latin, Arabic or Old Norse). In Canada, the only organization - to my knowledge - which concerns itself with language corpus planning is the "Office de la langue française" in the province of Quebec.

The institution was created in 1961. Its original mandate was the improvement of Quebec French. It attempted to fulfill its mandate by the development of standard vocabulary lists to be used in business, the media and the schools. Its successor, the "Regie de la langue française," was created in 1974 as part of the organization resulting from the "Official Language Act" (Bill 22). Among the several functions of the "Regie" is that it shall "... foster the correction and enrichment of the spoken and written language" (Mallea, 1977:Appendix). The context and the name of the organization should make it obvious that only the French language is considered here. In Bill 22 (which we will discuss further when we deal with language

status planning), the corpus planning functions were specified in great detail. The Minister responsible (designated as such by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council) was charged with the development of research in linguistics and with the coordination of linguistic research in Quebec (Section 49); the Lieutenant-Governor was enabled to establish "terminology committees" which were required to "... make an inventory of the technical expressions in use in the sector assigned to them, to indicate any lacunae that become apparent, and to prepare a list of the terms they recommend, particularly in the field of neologisms and borrowings" (Sections 50-53). The "Regie de la langue française" was also given the task of standardizing the usage of vocabulary in the province of Quebec and to approve the expressions and terms recommended by the terminology committees (Section 55), though the Act does not seem to indicate whether any sanctions could be applied against persons or organizations who were found to use expressions or terms not approved by the Regie de la langue française.

After the provincial elections of November 1976, the Parti Québecois took over from the Liberals. Within a year from entering office, the provincial government enacted Bill 101, the Charter of the French Language. While most of the language policies in this Bill deal with status planning, there were also provisions for corpus planning. As a consequence of the many language planning aspects of Bill 101, the "Regie de la langue française" was succeeded by three different organizations:

1. The Office de la langue française was to "define and conduct Quebec policy and research in linguistics and terminology" (chapter II, article 100). This board also set up terminology committees and supervised the use of proper French terminology in all government organizations;

2. the Conseil de la langue française was to monitor the implementation of language policies regarding status, use and quality of the French language (chapter IV, articles 188 and 189);

3. the Commission de surveillance et des enquêtes was created as a "control agency," to check whether language policies are in fact followed, to report any infractions of the law to the Attorney General and to start legal proceedings where necessary (chapter III, article 158).

Of these three boards, the Office has the clearest corpus planning function, through its research on terminology, the coordination of terminology committees and the supervision of language use in government departments. The emphasis in the Conseil and the Commission appears to be on status planning, though in both cases the mandate seems to allow for activities related to corpus planning. While the Commission de surveillance et des enquêtes has an obvious control function, it is not clear whether it is likely to recommend sanctions against organizations or persons who used unacceptable French terms

or expressions. Detailed discussions of the corpus planning aspects of Bill 101 may be found in Daoust, 1984.

Aside from the likely absence of sanctions in Quebec's language corpus planning efforts, it should be noted that these policies can only deal with the French language used in the province of Quebec. It may be interesting to investigate whether, for example, francophone civil servants in Ottawa use terms approved by Quebec's Office de la langue française. Such a study falls outside the scope of this book, however. In fact, further discussions of language corpus planning in general would take us too far away from the immediate concerns of this book. Readers interested in the successes and failures of language corpus planning in Quebec may wish to read some of the papers by Aleong and his fellow researchers (e.g., Aleong and Winer, 1982). This work contains some fascinating discussions and examples of the practical difficulties in eliminating the more stubborn anglicisms from the colloquial French used in automobile repair shops or in sports broadcasting.

No organization or institution appears to exist in Canada today for the purpose of standardizing the English language, as the Office de la langue française is designed to do for French in Quebec.

Of considerably more importance for our concerns is language status planning. In this side of language planning, the general function is to specify which languages must, may not, or may, be used in particular situations. In general (though not in all cases), such regulations affect only the "public" use of a language, although there are several examples of societies in which "private" language use was affected as well. In its most extreme manifestations, language planning in Germany under the National Socialists applied sanctions of death, incarceration or forced labour against those who used Yiddish or Polish in even the most private situations. Somewhat less harsh were the consequences of speaking Welsh or Irish in 19th century Britain, or of using the Breton language in Brittany. In very recent times, the former Khmer Rouge government of Kampuchea under Pol Pot prohibited the use of the Vietnamese language, apparently with rather severe sanctions to be applied against offenders. Lest you fear for your safety if you use the "wrong" language, rest assured that restrictions on the choice of language in "private" settings are quite rare. In many societies, using a language not commonly understood will invite milder sanctions, such as ostracism or ridicule, but so will many other unexpected forms of behaviour.

In Canada, language legislation covers only the use of language in public domains, such as the courts, the schools, the work world, communications with the federal government or provincial governments, and so on. With few exceptions, Canadian language rights only deal with the use of English or French in designated domains (the exceptions are generally those in which the use of Inuktitut or a Native Indian language is permitted in designated areas, such as Indian reserves or the Northern Territories, for specific purposes, such as broadcasting or education). Other languages are used as a result of initiatives taken by members of minority language com-

munities (such as the private "Saturday Schools," the "ethnic press" and a variety of voluntary associations). This type of minority language use is not protected by specific language laws. It can, therefore, only be considered as reflecting "language rights" in the sense that individuals are permitted , in Canadian society, to use the language of their choice in many settings and domains, as long as the "sender" and the "receiver" of messages are in agreement. (For example, people are allowed to form an Icelandic association and conduct all of their meetings in Icelandic. They do not have the "right" to use Icelandic in an Italian association. If they do, they cannot expect to be understood by their audience). Such conditions are better considered as "freedoms," tolerated by society as long as the use of such freedoms does not discriminate against other residents.

With regards to the use of English and French, we should consider two levels of government: the national government and the provincial ones.

At the national level (in other words, in domains under the jurisdiction of the federal government), language rights were, until 1982, outlined in Section 133 of the British North America Act. Although the B.N.A. Act has been replaced by the Constitution, we will briefly discuss the main features of the Act, because they have affected Canadian society from the beginning. Such effects are likely to have consequences well after the legislation has changed. Section 133 of the British North America Act stipulated that French and English may be used in the Houses of Parliament of Canada and the House of the Legislature of Quebec, as well as in the courts of Canada and Quebec. In addition, "... the Acts of the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those languages ...." (R.C.B.B., 1967:47).

Following the British North American Act by more than a century was the Official Languages Act of 1969. This Bill incorporated many of the recommendations made by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. It clarified the legal basis of Canadian official bilingualism. In addition, the Act calls for the appointment of an Official Language Commissioner, whose tasks are to ensure recognition of the status of the official languages and compliance with the spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act. The Act also required the creation of federal "Bilingual Districts," where federal governmental services would be provided in both official languages.

It is safe to state that the Official Languages Act and its eventual implementation have not made a profound impact on Canadian society of the 'Seventies'. No governments were defeated, no elections were won or lost because of it (if you are interested in international comparisons, you should consider the case of Belgium - another officially bilingual country - where language rights caused the defeat of many national governments). Canada's language laws appear not even to have affected the careers of individual politicians. The most "severe" reactions were probably provoked by the recommendations of the two Bilingual Districts Advisory Boards (which were set up to help the federal government design its "federal bilingual

districts"). Especially the proposal to make the entire province of Quebec one bilingual district caused widespread protest (Quebec was never made a federal bilingual district). Another application of the Act was instrumental in triggering off the strike by the Canadian Air Traffic controllers, when air traffic controllers and Canadian airline pilots resisted the official language policy on the grounds that the safety of passengers and crews might be affected. The strike was a relatively short one (it lasted from June 20 through June 28, 1976) and resulted in a "defeat" for the policy. Borins (1983) gives a very detailed analysis of the air traffic control conflict.

The only undisputed positive effect of the Official Languages Act appears to have been the generation of a moderate amount of official bilingualism among federal civil servants in the National Capital area. The effect is undoubtedly a positive one (though the associated cost was probably high), but there were also negative effects. One observer, in fact, has labelled the official language policy a failure, for the following reasons:

1. the official language policy did not appreciably increase the francophone share of the federal state bureaucracies (the public service and the crown corporations). For example, in higher executive positions in the federal civil service, the proportion of French Canadians changed from 13 percent in 1966 to 14.4 percent in 1971 (Guindon, 1978:232). While it may be tempting to comment that the rate of staff turnover required for a significant increase from the 13 percent noted for 1966 could hardly have materialized two years after the Official Language Act was passed, such arguments may be juxtaposed with somewhat more recent data. Coulombe provides some characteristics for the civil service for 1974 and 1975. The 1974 data show that English and French were "essential" for 92.7 percent of the "executive" positions in the public service at large, while 7.0 percent of these positions were designated as "English essential" and 0.3 percent as "French essential." (Coulombe, 1977:265). In the same article, data of April, 1975, tell us that the incumbents of these executive positions reported, as their language of work: English for 75.9 percent, French for 2.5 percent, both English and French for 13.2 percent. No indication of work language was given for 8.4 percent of the incumbents. (1977:269). Across all levels of employment in the federal public service, 12.2 percent of the public servants reported French as the language of work. After controlling for the language criteria of the position, Coulombe shows that the percentage reporting French as the language of work reached a maximum of 74.9 percent (in positions declared as "French essential"). For the jobs defined as "English and French essential," only 11.2 percent of the incumbents reported using French as their language of work (1977:268). These figures are not strictly comparable with Guindon's data, but they support his argument;

2. the official language policy has not succeeded in arresting the shift to English among French Canadians outside Quebec. The analyses in preceding chapters indeed bear this out, for 1971 as well as for 1981. It appears, in fact, that the shift to English has intensified for most of the French minorities during that decade;

3. the official language policy has hindered the modernization of Quebec's economy;

4. it has contributed to a "climate of ambiguity" for immigrants settling in Quebec and for corporations with headquarters or significant segments of their operations in the province of Quebec. The counterargument to this last point is, of course, that such ambiguity has been the result of contradictory language policies emanating from the federal and Quebec's provincial governments. Such ambiguities could be resolved or avoided by a greater degree of coordination between the governments involved, though the history of intergovernmental relations has shown the very small probabilities of such coordination happening.

Guindon sums up his evaluation of the Official Languages Act and the language policies associated with it, by asserting that they are "... part of the problem rather than the solution to the current crisis of the legitimacy of the Canadian state" (1978:244). While it is not all that obvious that the offical language policies were as dysfunctional as Guindon claims (one should, ideally, compare the observable effects of the adopted policies with the hypothesized effects of various alternative policies. Such evaluations are virtually impossible to conduct), one is hard pressed to demonstrate any significant positive effects on Canadian society as a whole. Given what we have found earlier about the fate of Canada's official language minorities (which, as you may recall, have been strongly affected by demographic and ecological factors, which generally produced a decline), this lack of success of a relatively weak policy ought not to be a surprise. The allocation of governmental responsibilities and controls in Canda is such that those domains in which most of the interactions of Canadian residents occur (the work world, the world of commerce, the schools and so forth) tend to fall under the jurisdiction of provincial governments. Even the effect of the bilingualism policy on the federal civil service (obviously a federal concern) was shown to be rather small.

The 1982 Constitution may, for these same reasons, end up with somewhat more of an impact, since the language rights guaranteed in its various sections may well affect the daily lives of many Canadians directly. Sections 16 and 22, which deal with the "official languages of Canada" reiterate the general provisions of the British North America Act - they define the rights to use French or English in the federal government and the government of the province of New Brunswick - and are thus not likely to have

much effect. In contrast, section 23 is likely to have some observable consequences. This section spells out "minority language educational rights." Specifically, Canadian citizens have the right to have their children receive primary and secondary school instruction in either of the official languages, provided that they (that is, the parents) either have English or French as mother tongue (the exact wording is: whose first language learned and still understood is that of the English or French linguistic minority population of the province in which they reside) or received their primary education in Canada in the minority language. In addition, Canadian citizens who had any one of their children educated, at the primary or secndary school level, in either English or French, have the right to have all their children educated in that language. The third component of section 23 then complicates life tremendously with the qualifier that these minority language educational rights apply only "wherever in the province the number of children of citizens who have such a right is sufficient to warrant the provision to them out of public funds of minority language instruction." (Incidentally, this preceding sentence is a beautiful illustration of the use of the elaborated code; if you don't immediately understand what the above clause means, you can appreciate the general difficulties encountered by the average Canadian citizen in deciphering "legalese" or "bureaucratese"). If you expect all the provinces to count the number of Canadian citizens claiming these rights and to provide minority language schools wihtout a fuss, you're very naïve. There are many grounds for squabbles and disputes, in part due to the fact that some terms have not been defined unambiguously, in part because several complications may well arise. For example: the qualifying "where numbers warrant" clause does not tell anyone at what magnitude the numbers "warrant" and at what value they don't. Provincial governments and official language minority groups may well defend quite different cut-off points. Complications may arise as a consequence of divorce and remarriage, especially when the parents have different mother tongues or received their education in different provinces. (For example, does a divorced mother of Italian mother tongue, resident in Quebec, whose former husband has English as mother tongue but lives in Ontario, have the right to send her children to an English school?). Section 23 appears to discriminate against foreign-born Canadians whose "first language learned and still understood" was not an official minority language (and, incidentally, also against native-born Canadians with "unofficial" mother tongues). My probably naïve reading leads me to conclude that such parents may well have grounds to claim that the system discriminates on the basis of national or ethnic origin, something which section 15 - on "equality rights" - prohibits. It is, incidentally, worth noting that section 15 mentions national or ethnic origin, but does not include mother tongue or any other language criterion!

These minority language education rights became, one would assume, effective when Queen Elizabeth signed the Act. However, section 59 pointedly denies these rights to a segment of Quebec's English minority, by stating that paragraph 23(1)(a) (which grants the rights to Canadian citizens whose mother tongue was that of the provincial linguistic minority) will only come in force in Quebec "on a day to be fixed by proclamation issued by the Queen

or the Governor General." Such a proclamation requires the prior authorization by the legislative assembly or the government of Quebec. It is likely that a large segment of the English minority in Quebec may well be quite constitutionally deprived of its language rights on the basis of section 59, since there appear to be no "sunset clauses," nor any other deadlines by which section 59 must be reviewed or repealed. The recent ruling by Quebec's Supreme Court, regarding the legality of these minority language rights, suggests that the battles over minority language education may be lengthy and acrimonious ones.

Language rights have been legislated at the provincial level as well. It is probably fair to state that the more immediate concerns of Canadian citizens and residents tend to fall under provincial jurisdiction, so that provincial language rights may have more of an impact than the federal ones appear to have had so far. Provincial language rights may be discussed in three segments: New Brunswick (in a class of its own), the other "English" provinces (with roughly identical situations) and the province of Quebec (in a class of its own).

New Brunswick is, at the moment, Canada's only officially bilingual province. In 1969, the province adopted its own Official Language Act, in which equal rights were granted to English and French for all matters under control of the provincial government. Among the most essential features of this Act were guarantees of access to the school system and to the provincial courts in French as well as English. Hobart reported in 1977 that "... both francophone and anglophone students now receive instruction in their mother tongue in all subjects at all levels. Second language instruction is required from grade 5 to grade 10, with a few exceptions, and is optional in grades 11 and 12." (1977:389). The New Brunswick government generally attempts to provide services in both languages in those parts of the province where francophones are concentrated. As we saw in preceding chapters, those areas (the Northern and Eastern counties) are the ones in which the French minority is most likely to maintain its share of the population and least subject to language shift. Even here, however, the recent demise of l'Evangeline (which was the only French daily newspaper published East of the province of Quebec) may give a hint that even this regional minority may be less secure than the analyses so far have suggested. It is premature to decide whether l'Acadie Nouvelle, the successor to l'Evangeline, will have any long-run viability. It may be that even the high level of access to French-language services in this region is inadequate to guarantee the long-term survival of the French minority.

The second group of provinces consists of the other eight provinces in which French is a minority language. In all of them, English is the only official language. Provision of services in French, in institutions under the jurisdiction of the respective provincial governments, is based on de facto practices in some areas and on ad hoc regulations. None of these provincial governments has shown a willingness to declare both English and French to be official languges. To be fair, I should point out that, in some

of the provinces, these ad hoc practices have developed into a fairly extensive array of French language services. The province of Ontario, in particular, has gradually increased the range of French language services during the years after the Final Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was submitted. A brief chronicle of the major steps may be illustrative: in 1968, shortly after the publication of Book I of the Royal Commission's Report, the premier of Ontario stated his government's intentions to provide public servies in French as well as English wherever such provisions were feasible. In the same year, the Ontario legislature passed legislation which permitted French-medium primary and secondary education to be offered in the province's public schools. As we saw earlier, the Carnegie study data had indicated that Ontario children of French mother tongue had lower levels of educational attainment than their counterparts of English or other mother tongues. The Carnegie study data, however, pertained to the period 1959 through 1965, well before the changes announced in 1968 could have any effect. Data, recent enough to document a possible decline in this educational disadvantage, are not available yet.

Further developments in Ontario include the granting of the right to all members of the provincial legislature to use either English or French in addressing the Speaker of the House in 1970. In 1975, provincial courts in designated areas were permitted to hold trials in French; this right was extended to the entire province in 1979. In spite of all these accommodations and concessions, the provincial government has so far refused to take the final step of declaring French to have equal status with English. Moreover, periodic disagreements over French language schools and the creation of French-language school boards suggest that the actual level of services is not entirely satisfactory to Franco-Ontarians.

Information about the ecology of French-language services in Ontario suggests that they are concentrated in Eastern Ontario. Recall from the preceding chapters that this was also the region in which francophones showed the highest degree of language maintenance. The association between the viability of a regional linguistic minority and the access to public services in that language is easily established; the specification of a causal connection is not so easy, nor is it safe to make long-range forecasts.

The final province to be considered is Quebec. Here we encounter the somewhat unusual situation that a demographic majority - the population of French mother tongue in Quebec - has gradually developed legislation to protect itself from a slow "erosion," caused by the attraction of a minority language (English) as the language of business of power and economic control. As Laporte points out, the involvement of the "Quebec state" in legislating language rights coincided with the beginning of Quebec's "Quiet Revolution," (which had its origins shortly after the end of the Second World War) (Laporte, 1983:2). After the Quebec Liberal party, headed by Jean Lesage, came to power in 1960, it entered the language planning arena with the creation of the Office de la langue française in 1961. As we saw earlier, the primary task of this organization was to engage in corpus planning.

Status planning in Quebec got its real start in 1968 with the passing of Bill 85, an amendment to the "Education Department Act." This Bill, essentially a reaction to the controversy about the language of schooling in St. Leonard, a Montreal suburb, granted parents the right to choose the language of instruction for their children (i.e., French or English), provided - in the case of English - that those children were deemed capable of following instruction in that language. In addition, Bill 85 empowered Quebec's Minister of Education to take all measures necessary to ensure that immigrant and internal migrants to Quebec could acquire a working knowledge of French.

Bill 85 was rather short lived, only to be replaced in 1969 by Bill 63, the "Act to Promote the French Language in Quebec." This Bill confirmed the right of parents to request that their children be educated either in French or in English (Section 2). It further continued the measures from Bill 85 intended to ensure that children who received their instruction in English acquired a working knowledge of French. It is interesting to note that, before the introduction of Bills 85 and 63, the right to public education in English was not granted under Quebec law (nor was it declined, for the matter). Further provisions of this Bill were designed to promote the use of French, specifically "to see to it that French is the working language in public and private undertakings in Quebec" (Section 14). To this goal, the "Office de la langue française" was required to develop programmes which would help employees of many different kinds of firms to acquire a working knowledge of French, to hear complaints about the use of French at work (the lack thereof, of course), to conduct inquiries and to make recommendations. With Bill 63, Quebec's language legislation moves, for the first time, from a concern with education only to a concern with the work world. In the following decade, this trend will continue with more and more intrusive measures.

At the same time when all this legislation activity occurred, the provincial government appointed, in December 1968, the "Commission of Inquiry on the Position of French Language Rights in Quebec," generally called the "Gendron Commission" after its chairman. The Commission spawned a lot of detailed research on language use in the province, some of which was referred to in earlier chapters of this book. The final report, with recommendations, was submitted to the provincial government in December 1972. In 1973, the Liberal party under Robert Bourassa came to power; it wasted little time in introducing the "Official Language Act" (Bill 22) in July, 1974. Several provisions in this Bill were inspired by the findings of the Gendron Commission. Moreover, this Bill shows the continuing intrusion of the Quebec state into the private domains of Quebec's language use. French is now declared to be the official language of Quebec (Section 1). In case of divergence, the French text of Quebec statutes will prevail over the English version (Section 2), thus clearly relegating English to a lower legal status than it had before. The official status of the French language led to requirements that it must be the language of the provincial public service and of contracts with the government and other state bureaucracies. Inci-

dentally, the Bill also requires that members of the Quebec civil service use French in their communiciations with the federal government. The further impact of this Bill on Quebec's private sector can be illustrated by the following points: the provincial government would, in awarding contracts, give preference to companies which favoured the French language. The Bill also regulated the naming of firms, the labelling of products, menus and wine lists, the language used on public signs, written advertisements (those appearing in newspapers published in languages other than French were exempted from this), billboards and so on. In all these cases, French must be used, but other languages were still permitted alongside the French text.

The use of French in the work world - including the private sector - was promoted by "francization programmes," to be eventually awarded by a certificate. The coercive nature of these requirements becomes clear when we realize that, eventually, the francization certificate would be required if a firm wanted to receive premiums or subsidies from the provincial government or have a contract with the government.

With regards to education, chapter V (Sections 40-44) restricted the entry to the English school system to those pupils who had a sufficent knowledge of the language of instruction; children who knew neither English nor French were required to attend French language schools. To ensure that children destined for the English schools indeed had sufficient knowledge of English, tests were designed for that purpose. Note that the Bill does not single out the English school system for these tests, but the provisions of section 41 - which make French the "default option" - made the tests unnecessary for children to be enrolled in the French schools.

Bill 22 had, like its predecessors, only a short life. I already mentioned Bill 101, enacted by the Parti Québecois government in August 1977. The main thrust of the Bill was in the area of language status planning; in that aspect, it goes much further than any previous provincial law in its aim of transforming Quebec into an essentially francophone society. French is now proclaimed as the only official language of the province. The use of French is now required by the civil administration, the health care system, social services, public utility firms, professional corporations, associations of employees, and all firms conducting business in Quebec. The use of French became required, and the use of all other languages prohibited, for billboards, the names of firms, places and so forth. Access to the English school system was regulated very precisely, as we saw in chapter 4. As Laporte has pointed out, the various facets of this Bill combine into a form of "labour market planning." Recall that the educational aspects of the legislation are intended to restrict access to, and thus curtail the growth of, the English school system in Quebec. Since these restrictions affect, in particular, the access to English schooling for others settling in the province - as immigrants, internal migrants and temporary workers - future hiring practices will have to change, since sufficient knowledge of French is a prerequisite for most jobs in the province. As such, the Bill will have

the effect of providing a wider range of occupational choice for those able to speak French.

In a recent evaluation of Quebec's language planning efforts through Bill 101, Laporte specifies that "There is an economic rationale in Bill 101, an 'unstated premise', suggesting that the affirmation of the French language, of its status, of its opportunities for use, of its social usefulness and its numerical strength will bring economic benefits to francophone Quebecers." (1984;72). One intended consequence was to make Quebec francophones more satisfied with conditions in the workplace and consequently more productive.

In addition to Laporte's evaluation of Bill 101, some other observations may be made. The legislation has obviously succeeded in making French the public language in Quebec. Several surveys yielded evidence that the use of French at work has continued to increase (see Breton and Grant, 1981, for a detailed analysis of the data). Moreover,Quebec francophones have begun to make faster progress in the various corporate hierarchies than they did in earlier decades. Laporte showed that the direct cost for the various francization programmes was very low. In those facets, the policy was an obvious success. On the other side of the coin, we note that Quebec's English mother tongue population declined from about 800,000 in 1976 to about 700,000 in 1981. The causal link between Quebec's language legislation and the rather drastic decline of its Anglophone population is not as neat and simple as many people would like to believe; obviously, employment opportunities in other provinces also played a role, in attracting workers from Quebec and in reducing the flow of workers to Quebec. However, the effect of the population flows may have been that Quebec residents who were unable or unwilling to use French at work left the province at their earliest opportunity. Many of the Anglophones who remained may well have made efforts to improve their facility in French. This "exodus" of English speakers from Quebec may well have been a strong contributing factor to the upward mobility of Quebec's francophones. A probably unintended consequence of all this has been that Quebec's share of the total Canadian population has declined. Thus, the increased "weight" of the province's population in the country as a whole. It appears that this proportional decline will be very difficult to reverse in the foreseeable future.

Debates about the exact causal linkages between Quebec's langauge policies and the shifting power relations between anglophones and francophones in the province will undoubtedly continue for many years to come. The resolution of such debates is beyond the scope of this manuscript. The "French fact" in Quebec appears to be well established at the moment. However, this apparently successful "francization" may well have resulted in further polarization between Quebec and the remainder of the country. Such polarization cannot be expected to be of benefit to the various linguistic minorities (which may well become the real victims of the political developments), nor is it likely to have a positive effect on "national unity."

I wish to conclude this brief discussion of language rights with a personal comment. Much of my quantitative research on linguistic minorities has dealt with the Swedish-speaking minority of Finland, another officially bilingual country. One of the main features of Finland's language laws appears to be that the legislation has been designed to accommodate the Swedish-speaking minority, without constraining the right of the Finnish-speaking majority. Canada's federal language legislation appears to have at least a sense of accommodation. In contrast, however, Quebec's Bill 101 seems to be much more constraining with regards to minority language rights. Such an orientation is quite ironic, given the "model" for the Parti Quebecois: to transform Quebec into a social democracy, for which the various Scandinavian nation-states served as examples. It appears to me that the Levesque government lost its first opportunity to follow through on this election promise when, rather than demonstrating the noted Scandinavian tolerance, it introduced Bill 101. Now that the immediate "threat" to the French language (if ever there were any) appears to have been averted, the time may be ripe for a demonstration of tolerance and accommodation. In the long run, such a change of orientation may be beneficial to all.

CHAPTER 8: SUMMARY

In the preceding seven chapters, I have attempted to demonstrate that language is a social phenomenon, both in general and in Canadian society. We have seen that a definition of "language" involves linguistic components as well as sociological components: communication is a fundamental social process (without which society and community cannot exist); moreover, this process involves at least two "actors," a "sender" and a "receiver." It also became clear, as we went through some of these discussions, that the nature of specific elements of communication (messages) was a function of the social characteristics of the actors involved.

After these basic definitions, we considered some data on Canada's language communities. The dominance of English and, to a lesser degree, French, was suggested in terms of community size (regardless of the precise way in which membership in a language community would be measured). We also noted the relatively high level of segregation between these two language communities. Obviously, there are regional concentrations of English speakers and French speakers with, in addition, members of other language communities scattered over the Canadian territory in a non-random fashion. Even on the relatively crude basis of language data by county, we could distinguish six distinct "linguistic regions," which cut across provincial boundaries. Other linguistic and behavioural characteristics were shown to be associated with these regional divisions.

In chapter 3, we considered the various demographic processes by means of which language communities increase or decrease. Of the "traditional" demographic factors (fertility, mortality, migration), migration probably had the strongest effects. In addition, language shift - which may be studied in a way similar to the method by which internal migration is often analyzed - turned out to have a strong impact on the fate of Canadian language communities. While the analyses in chapter 3 can only provide estimates of the effects of language shift, it appears that minority language communities generally suffer substantial losses due to language shift to the majority language in their immediate surroundings. Generally, such shift goes to English - probably even in parts of the province of Quebec - and to French; the latter probably only benefits the French langauge community in the interior of Quebec, where the concentration of English speakers is the lowest. These processes, it should be noted, affected immigrants to Canada as well as the French speaking minorities outside Quebec. Especially the Francophone groups in Western Canada seem to have lost large proportions of their original membership as a consequence of a shift to the use of English.

When we turned from the demographic analysis of Canadian language communities to a macrosociological consideration, we again noted the dominant position of the country's official languages. The widespread use of English in the work world was demonstrated, both for the Federal civil service and within the province of Quebec. While, in both situations, French was (obviously) also used as a language of work, its utilization was almost certainly lower than one might expect on the basis of the size of the French language community. Languages other than English or French were rarely used in work situations. Only among groups with relatively recent immigration and a concentration of workers in specific sectors of the economy was there any

notable use of other languages (in particular, Portuguese, Chinese, Greek and Italian).

Education reinforces the dominant position of the official languages: other than English and French, only some North American Indian languages and Inuktitut are used in the regular school systems in the country. The languages of immigrant groups are only taught in part-time "schools" and Saturday morning classes (except, of course, the offering of high school courses and university programs in languages of wider communication such as German, Spanish, Russian and so on).

The mass media, too, support the official languages disproportionately. Radio and television broadcasting is almost exclusively in English or French; the printed media contain a small segment of "ethnic" publications which, however, appear weekly or even less frequently.

Thus, we find that "minority languages" (that is, the "other" languages such as Ukrainian, Chinese or Rumanian, as well as the regional minority languages: French outside Quebec and English in some parts of Quebec) do not fare well in the public domains of language use: work, education, mass media. By inference, such languages are then used primarily in the more private domains of family, friendship, neighbourhood and, probably, religion. The discussions of language shift in preceding chapters suggest that such "domain segregation" will generally lead to the decline and eventual disappearance of minority language communities.

In addition to the demography, ecology and institutional support structure of language communities in Canada, some correlates of membership in a particular language community were discussed. Most important for the overall perspective I have tried to establish are the differences in educational attainment. Such achievements are highest for members of the English language community, as well as some of the immigrant groups (Dutch, Scandinavian and German come nearest to the English group). Other immigrant groups, as well as the French, have lower levels of educational attainment. We saw that having English as mother tongue had a distinct effect on the level of schooling, regardless of the individual's place of birth (Canada or elsewhere) or ethnic origin.

The lower level of schooling attained by those with French mother tongue was analyzed in some greater detail. Data collected by the Carnegie Study of high school students on all pupils who entered grade 9 in Ontario in 1959 showed that those students who spoke French most often at home performed considerably less well in Ontario during the period 1959-1965 than did their counterparts who spoke a language other than French at home. This lower performance was indicated by lower grade transition ratios as well as lower percentages graduating. The differences could not be attributed to lower socio-economic status of the Francophone group, nor to their lower proportion living in urban areas, nor to different attitudes towards schooling and career expectations. One possible factor, overlooked by the Royal Commission

on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, may have been "semilingualism," that is the condition in which a speaker does not know a language as well as monolingual native speakers. Research on the language competence of Franco-Ontarians in several minority settings indicates that, indeed, these respondents showed marked deficiencies in French, their mother tongue. Such findings provide confirmatory evidence for the hypothesis that users of restricted codes are at a disadvantage in an educational system which puts a premium on the use of elaborated codes.

When we considered the consequences of language characteristics (that is, the access to social goods and resources as a consequence of one's membership in a given language community or one's ability to speak a particular language), we found that persons of British ethnic origin were overrepresented in the higher levels of the occupational hierarchy, while those of French ethnic origin and of various "immigrant" origins were concentrated at the lower occupational levels. While it should be remembered that these data refer to ethnic origin (not strictly a linguistic characteristic), it has been shown that there are very strong connections between French ethnic origin and French mother tongue (in the sense that almost every person of French mother tongue is also of French ethnic origin), as well as between British ethnic origin and English mother tongue (in this case, virtually everyone of British ethnic origin has English as mother tongue). Richmond and Kalbach found that these discrepancies in the occupational distribution were not primarily attributable to lower educational attainment for immigrants, nor to differences in age structure. It is at least plausible to assume that immigrants whose mother tongue is not English may generally use a restricted code when they do speak English, and therefore be at a disadvantage when they compete for higher level managerial or professional positions with persons whose mother tongue is English (and who are thus more likely to use an elaborated code). In some contrast to this, Richmond and Kalbach found that the lower occupational attainment of those of French ethnic origin appeared to be a function of their lower educational attainment.

Within the province of Quebec, the research studies conducted in connection with the Gendron Commission in the early 1970's showed a similar overrepresentation of English speakers among administrative and professional workers, in particular in manufacturing, public utilities and the financial sector of the economy. This overrepresentation was especially marked in the larger establishments (which were disproportionately owned by English speakers).

The impact of Quebec's language legislation appears to be demonstrated by Vaillancourt's findings which pertain to the later part of the 70's: his findings show increasing representation of persons with French as mother tongue in managerial positions, probably as a consequence of the increased use of French as the language of work.

Studies of occupational mobility have documented the differences in opportunity structures for the French and English segments in the province of Quebec for much of the period after the end of the Second World War. These studies have shown a gradual convergence of "mobility regimes," with the most recent analysis (based on data collected in 1973) indicating that lower occupational attainment of Francophone males in Quebec was only due to their lower level of education and a lower socio-economic origin. The educational disadvantage apparently operated in two ways in the earlier years: an "indirect" mechanism (by which Francophones with given levels of educational attainment were unable to transform that resource into an adequate first job), which could be called a "lower rate of return to education," and a "direct" effect in which no differential "rate of return" was observed. In more recent years, only the direct effect appears to have operated.

The French-English differences in occupational attainment were obviously associated with lower labour incomes (i.e., wages and salaries). Various studies by Quebec economists have shown that, at least until the early 70's, there was a premium on the ability to speak English in Quebec: after standardization on many factors known to have an effect on labour income, Vaillancourt found that, in 1970, males of English mother tongue earned on average over 20 percent more than did unilingual men of French mother tongue. Bilingual men of French mother tongue earned 17 percent more than their Unilingual counterparts. The data for Quebec women showed the same pattern, though the differences were only about 8 percent. In 1978, the effects of mother tongue had virtually disappeared, to be replaced by a premium on bilingualism: bilingual Anglophones earned an average 7.8 percent more than did unilingual men of French mother tongue. For females, the only remaining effect was that, in 1978, bilingual women of French mother tongue earned 7.9 percent more than those in the other categories.

Finally, we found that, for all provinces, households whose head was of French mother tongue were more likely to fall into the "low income" category than were all other households. While such data do not allow for the essential standardization (to estimate the effects of lower education, differences in age structure, household structure and the like), the gross differences observed were consistent with the other data reported in this manuscript.

The mixture of analyses of "returns to language" suggested that several groups in Canadian society (primarily those of French mother tongue and those born outside Canada) were disadvantaged, primarily in educational attainment. This disadvantage generally translated into lower levels of occupational attainment and consequently lower income from work. Very little of the overall difference in occupational attainment or income could be attributed to "discrimination" or "differential returns to education." If these findings are indeed reflecting true conditions, policies of "affirmative action" (i.e., the development and use of quota systems in hiring of workers, occupational promotions or salary levels) would not tackle the basic problem of inequality and as such would only be "stop-gap" measures. The correct

approach would be (is, if we take the above interpretations to be correct) for the various governments to ensure that Francophones and other Canadian liguistic minorities have equal access to education as do Canadians of English mother tongue. To the degree that access to higher education is still in significant measure a privilege of the wealthier groups in society (a condition which appears to have worsened during the second half of the 70's), virtually all of Canada's linguistic minorities appear to be disadvantaged. Policies which are designed to facilitate access to higher education for students from low-income backgrounds (such as bursaries, fellowships, interest-free student loans, low tuition fees) are likely to have the desired effect with regards to the reduction of differences associated with language. Policies with obverse features (such as the contraction of bursary and loan programmes, or increases in tuition fees) are not only generally regressive, they are particularly dysfunctional with regards to the removal of the effects of language on socio-economic characteristics of Canadians.

With regard to existing language policies, we saw that relatively little exists at the federal level and for virtually all provinces. Some rights can be identified, but they are overall probably insufficient to have major effects on the survival of minority languages. Moreover, such rights almost certainly are not in any way addressing the educational and socio-economic effects of language which have been suggested in the preceding analyses. The only province in which language legislation has been developed rigorously is the province of Quebec, which has been in the unusual situation of requiring specific language laws for the protection of the (demographic) linguistic majority. The sequence of language laws had, at the beginning of the 1980's, the effect that Quebec became a much more markedly "french" province than it was twenty years earlier. The available data suggest that occupational opportunities for Francophones in Quebec had greatly expanded, while those for Anglophones had contracted rather significantly. During the same period, access to English-medium primary and secondary schools had become much more difficult. These effects developed concurrently with a rather drastic decline in the size of the English mother tongue community in Quebec and a rather low net immigraiton to the province. Whether, in the long run, the legislation has the effect of annihilating the major social and economic disadvantages of Quebec's Francophones remains to be seen.

This overall analysis has, in addition to the summary and connection of previously disjointed research findings, demonstrated the lack of an integrated body of data. The reader may have become aware of the fact that the data brought to bear in the earlier chapters were collected by sociologists, anthropologists, political scientists, economists, geographers and linguists (there may well be other disciplines, but the above are certainly the ones most clearly represented), all with their own ways of approaching problems and assessing evidence. While the picture presented by these isolated findings appears to be consistent, there is certainly a need for more evidence, preferably collected under the joint guidance of linguists and social scientists from a variety of disciplines.

REFERENCES

Aleong, S. and Winer, L.
1982 "Sociolinguistic factors governing the retention of branded loan-words in the Quebec French lexicon," *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 6, 2:115-136.

Anttila, R.
1972 *An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics.* New York: The MacMillan Company.

Bell, R.T.
1976 *Sociolinguistics*. London: St. Martin's Press.

Bernstein, B.
1961 "Aspects of language and learning in the genesis of the social process," *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 1:313-324.

1965 "A sociolinguistic approach to social learning," in Gould, J. (ed.), *Penguin Survey of the Social Sciences:* 144-168. Harmondsworth, U.K.: Penguin Books Ltd.

Blishen, B.R.
1967 "A socioeconomic index for occupation in Canada," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 4:41-53.

Blishen, B.R. and McRoberts, H.A.
1976 "A revised socioeconomic index for occupations in Canada," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 13:71-79.

Bloomfield, L.
1933 *Language*, New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Bogue, D.J. and Palmore, J.A.
1964 "Some empirical and analytic relations among demographic fertility measures, with regression models for fertility estimation," *Demography*, 1:316-338.

Boissevain, J.
1970 *Italians of Montreal: Social Adjustment in a Plural Society.* Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Borins, S.F.
1983 *The language of the Skies. The Bilingual Air Traffic Control Conflict in Canada.* Kingston-Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Bourhis, R.Y. (ed.)
1984 *Conflict and Language Planning in Quebec.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H.
1976 *Schooling in Capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books.

Boyd, M. et al. (eds.)
1985 *Ascription and Achievement*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

BRAZEAU, E.J.
1958 "Language differences and occupational experience," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 24:532-540.

1969 "Quebec's Emerging Middle Class," in Rioux, M. and Martin, Y. (eds.) *French Canadian Society*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd.

Breton, R. and Grant, G.
1981 *La langue de travail au Québec*. Montréal: L'Institut de recherches politiques.

Bright, W. (ed.)
1966 *Sociolinguistics*. The Hague: Mouton.

Brown, R.
1973 *A First Language*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Burling, R.
1970 *Man's Many Voices. Language in its Cultural Context*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Canada, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
1967 *Linguistic and cultural affiliations of Canadian Indian Bands*. Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch.

1969 *Linguistic and cultural affiliations of Canadian Indian Bands*. Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch.

1970 *Linguistic and cultural affiliations of Canadian Indian Bands*. Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch.

Canada, Statistics Canada
1974 *Perspective Canada*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Castonguay, C.
1977 "La mobilité ethnique au Canada," *Recherches Sociographiques*, 18:431-450.
1979 "Exogamie et anglicisation chez les minorités Canadiennes-françaises," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 16:21-31.

Chan, D.C.
1979 The status attainment of Francophones and Anglophones in Quebec: an application of the vacancy competition model. Ottawa: Carleton University, Unpublished M.A. Thesis (Sociology).

Coulombe, P.E.
1977 "Bilinguisme institutionnel et bilinguisme individuel," in Coons W.H. et al. (eds.), *The Individual, Language and Society in Canada*. Ottawa: The Canada Council.

Daoust, D.
1984 "Francization and terminology change in Quebec business firms," pp. 81-113 in Bourhis, R.Y. (ed.), *Conflict and language planning in Quebec*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Davis, K.
1948 *Human Society*. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Demers, L.
1979 Evaluation de la qualité des informations ethniques et linguistiques fournies par les recensements canadiens 1901 à 1976. M.A. Thesis (Demographie) University of Montreal.

Dillard, N.
1972 *Black English*. New York: Vintage Books.

Dittmar, N.
1976 *Sociolinguistics: A Critical Survey of Theory and Application*. London: Edward Arnold.

Dofny, J. and Garon-Audy, M.
1969 "Mobilités professionnelles au Québec." *Sociologie et Sociétés*. 1,2.

Driedger, L., Vallée, F.G. and de Vries, J.
Forthcoming "Towards an ecology of language characteristics in Canada." To appear in: St. Clair, R. and Nahir (eds.), *Language and the Politics of Accommodation*.

Elkins, F.
1973 *Rebels and Colleagues: Advertising and Social Change in Canada*. Montreal: Mcgill-Queen's University Press.

Engle, M.
1980 "Language and play: a comparative analysis of parental initiatives," in Giles, H. et al. (eds.), *Language. Social Psychological Perspectives*. Oxford: Pergamon Press. (pp. 29-34).

Farb, P.
1973 *Word Play: What Happens When People Talk.* New York: Bantam Books.

Fédération des Francophones hors Québec
1977 *Les héritiers de Lord Durham.* Ottawa: FFHQ.

1978 *Deux poids, deux mesures (un dossier comparatif).* Ottawa:FFHQ.

Ferguson, C.A.
1959 "Diglossia," *Word.* 15, 2:325-340.

Fishman, J.A.
1965 "Who speaks what language to whom and when?" *La linguistique.* 2:67-88.

Fishman, J.A. (ed.)
1974 *Advances in Language Planning.* The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, J.A. et al.
1966 *Language Loyalty in the United States.* The Hague: Mouton.

Fougstedt, G. and Hartman, T.
1956 "Social factors affecting the choice of language by children of Finnish-Swedish mixed marriages in Finland," *Transactions of the Westermarck Society,* 3:34-54.

Gendron, J.-D.
1972 *The position of the French Language in Quebec.* Volume 1: *Language of Work.* Quebec: L'Editeur officiel du Québec.

Gryz, Z.J.
1977 "A modification of Lieberson's technique for estimating inter-generational language shift," in Lamy, P. (ed.), *Language Maintenance and Shift in Canada: New Dimensions in the Use of Census Language Data.* Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Guindon, H.
1960 "The social evolution of Quebec reconsidered,"*Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science,* 26:533-551.

1964 "Social unrest, social class and Quebec's bureaucratic revolution," *Queen's Quarterly,* 71:150-162.

1978 "The modernization of Quebec and the legitimacy of the Canadian state," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology.* 15:227-245.

Hall, R.A. Jr.
1964 *Introductory Linguistics*. Philadelphia: Chilton Books.

Hawley, A.H.
1950 *Human Ecology. A Theory of Community Structure*. New York: The Ronald Press.

Henripin, J.
1974 *L'immigration et le déséquilibre linguistique*. Ottawa: Information Canada.

Hertzler, J.O.
1965 *A Sociology of Language*. New York: Random House.

Hobart, C.
1977 "Language planning in Canada: politics and practices," in Coons, W.H. et al. (eds.), *The Individual, Language and Society*. Ottawa: The Canada Council, 364-402.

Hormann, H.
1981 *To Mean - To Understand. Problems of Psychological Semantics*. Berlin/Heidelberg/New York: Springer Verlag.

Hugues, E.C.
1943 *French Canada in Transition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jackson, J.D.
1978 "National consciousness and class: a comment on Laurin's view of the history of Quebec," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 15, 2:136-141.

de Jocas, Y. and Rocher, G.
1957 "Inter-generation occupational mobility in the province of Quebec," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 23:58-66.

Joy, R.L.
1972 *Languages in Conflict — The Canadian Experience*. Toronto-Montreal: McClelland and Stewart.

Kalbach, W.E. and McVey, W.W.
1971 *The demographic Bases of Canadian Society*. Toronto: McGraw Hill.

Keyfitz, N.
1963 "Canadians and Canadiens," *Queen's Quarterly*, 70:171-174.

Kloss, H. and McConnell, G. (eds.)
1978 *Linguistic Composition of the Nations of the World: Vol. II (North America)*, Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Kloss, H.
1969 *Grundfragen der Ethnopolitik im 20.* Jahrhundert. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller.

Kralt, J.
1976 *Languages in Canada.* Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Labov, W.
1966 *The Social Stratification of English in New York City.* Washington D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

Lachapelle, R. and Henripin, J.
1982 *The Demolinguistic Situation in Canada.* Montréal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Lacroix, M. and Adams, E.
1950 "Statistics for the cultural assimilation of migrants," *Supplement to Population Studies*, 69-108.

Lambert, W.E.
1980 *Language, Psychology and Culture.* Stanford: University Press.

Langacker, R.W.
1973 *Language and its Structure.* New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.

Laponce, J.A.
1984 *Langue et territoire.* Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Laporte, P.E.
1984 "Status language planning in Quebec: an evaluation," pp. 53-80 in Bourhis, R.Y. (ed.), *Conflict and Language Planning in Quebec.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Laurin, C.
1978 "Charte de la langue française – French language charter," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 15, 2:115-127.

Lieberson, S.
1970 *Language and Ethnic Relations in Canada.* New York: Wiley.

McRoberts, H.A.
1975 Social Stratification in Canada: A Preliminary Analysis. Ottawa: Carleton University (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation).

McRoberts, H. et al.
1976 "Differences dans la mobilité professionnelle des Francophones et des Anglophones," *Sociologie et Société*, 8:61-79.

McRoberts, H.A.
1986 "Language and mobility: a comparison of three groups," in Boyd, M. et al. (eds.), *Ascription and Achievement*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Mallea, J.R. (ed.)
1977 *Quebec's Language Policies: Background and Response*. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Maxwell, T.R.
1977 *The Invisible French: The French in Metropolitan Toronto*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Mougeon, R. et al.
1982 *Le français parlé en situation minoritaire*. Québec: Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme (Publication B-105).

Pike, R.M.
1980 "Education, class and power in Canada," in Ossenberg, R.J. (ed), *Power and Change in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Pineo, P.C. and Porter, J.
1985 "Ethnic origin and occupational attainment," in Boyd, M. et al. (eds.), *Ascription and Achievement*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Porter, J.
1956 "The concentration of economic power and the economic elite in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 22:199-220.

1957 "The economic elite and the social structure in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 23:377-394.

1965 *The Vertical Mosaic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

1985 "Canada: the societal content of occupational allocation," in Boyd, M. et al. (eds.), *Ascription and Achievement*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Pride, J.B. and Holmes, J. (eds.)
1972 *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondworth: Penguin Books.

Reitz, J.G.
1980 *The Survival of Ethnic Groups*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Richmond, A.H. and Kalbach, W.E.
1980 *Factors in the Adjustment of Immigrants and their Descendants*. (Census Analytical Study). Ottawa: Department of Supply and Services.

Rioux, M.
1978 "Bill 101: a positive anglophone point of view," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 15, 2:142-144.

Rocher, G.
1975 "Formal education: the issue of opportunity," in Forcese, D.P. and Richer, S. (eds.), *Issues in Canadian Society. An Introduction to Sociology*. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall.

Rommetveit, R.
1974 *On Message Structure; a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Language and Communication*. London: Wiley.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism
1967 Report, Book I. *General Introduction*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada.

1968 Report, Book II. *Education*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada.

1969 Report, Book III. *The Work World*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada.

1970 Report, Book IV. *The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada.

Rubin, J. et al. (eds.)
1977 *Language Planning Processes*. The Hague: Mouton.

Russell, P.H.
1982 *Leading Constitutional Decisions* (3rd Edition). Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Ryder, N.B.
1955 "The interpretation or origin statistics," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 21:466-479.

Sapir, R.
1921 *Language*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.

de Saussure, F.
1966 *Course in General Linguistics* (edited by Bally, C. and Sechehaye, A.): (translated by Aasking, W.) (original French edition dates back to 1915). New York: McGraw Hill.

Shryock, H.S. and Siegel, J.S.
1973 *The Methods and Materials of Demography*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Sills, D.L. (ed.)
1968 *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*. New York: Crowell Collier and MacMillan.

Skuttnab-Kangas, T.
1978 *Tvaspråkighet*. Lund: Liber Läromedel.

Stromsholm, G.
1975 *Den finlandssvenska presse-debatten om en egen tv-kanal år 1973*. Åbo: SLS nämnd for samhalls-forskning.

Tetlock, G. and Mori, G.
1977 *Educational Attainment in Canada*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Trudgill, P.
1982 *Sociolinguistics and Linguistic Change*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Vaillancourt, F.
1981 "The economics of language planning; an application to the case of Quebec (1960-1980)." Paper presented at the 6th International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Lund (mimeo).

Vallee, F.G. and de Vries, J.
1977 *Data Book on Aspects of Language Demography in Canada*. Ottawa: The Canada Council.

Vanasse, D.
1981 *L'évolution de la population scolaire du Québec*. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.

De Vries, J.
1974 "Net effects of language shift in Finland, 1951-1960: a demographic analysis." *Acta Sociologica*, 17:140-149.

1977 "Explorations in the demography of language: estimation of net language shift in Finland, 1961-1970." *Acta Sociologica*, 20:145-153.

de Vries, J. and Vallee, F.G.
1975 *Data Book on Aspects of Language Demography in Canada.* Ottawa: The Canada Council.

1980 *Language Use in Canada.* Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Weinreich, U.
1953 *Languages in Contact.* New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

APPENDIX

Counties and Census Divisions Comprising the Language Regions of Canada

1. Northern Canada

Newfoundland Census Division 10 (Labrador); Quebec counties Abitibi, Saguenay; Ontario County Kenora; Manitoba Census Division 16; Saskatchewan Census Division 18; Albert Census Divisions 12, 15; British Columbia Districts Bulkley-Nechako, Kitimat-Stikine, Peace River-Liard, Stikine; Northwest Territories, Yukon.

2. Anglophone Maritimes

Newfoundland, except Census Division 10; Prince Edward Island; Nova Scotia; New Brunswick counties Albert, Carleton, Charlotte, Kings, Queens, St. John, Sunbury, York.

3. Quebec Heartland

Quebec counties Arthabaska, Bagot, Beauce, Bellechasse, Berthier, Champlain, Charlevoix-Est, Charlevois-Ouest, Iles-de-la-Madeleine, Joliette, Kamouraska, Labelle, Lac St. Jean-Est, Lac St. Jean-Ouest, Levis, L'Islet, Lotbiniere, Maskinonge, Matane, Matapedia, Megantic, Montcalm, Montmagny, Montmorency 1, Montmorency 2, Napierville, Nicolet, Portneuf, Quebec, Richelieu, Rimouski, Rivière-du-Loop, St. Hyacinthe, St. Maurice, Temiscouata, Wolfe, Yamaska.

4. Bilingual Belt

New Brunswick counties Gloucester, Kent, Madawaska, Northumberland, Restigouche, Victoria, West Morland; Quebec counties Argentueil, Beauhornois, Bonaventure, Brome, Chambly, Chateauguay, Compton, Deux-Montagnes, Gaspe-Est, Gatineau, Hull, Huntingston, Iberville, Ile-de-Montreal et Ile-Jesus, Laprairie, L'Assomption, Missisquoi, Papineau, Pontiac, Richmond, Rouville, St. Jean, Shefford, Sherbrooke, Soulanges, Stanstead, Temiscamingue, Terrebonne, Vaudreuil, Vercheres; Ontario counties Algoma, Cochrane, Glengarry, Nipissing, Ottawa-Carleton, Prescott, Russell, Stormont, Sudbury, Timiskaming.

5. "Upper Canada"

Ontario counties Brant, Bruce, Dufferin, Dundas, Durham, Elgin, Essex, Frontenac, Grenville, Grey, Haldimand, Haliburton, Halton, Hasting, Huron, Kent, Lambton, Lanark, Leeds, Lennox, Manitoulin, Middlesex, Muskoka, Niagara, Norfolk, Northumberland, Ontario, Oxford, Parry Sound, Peel, Perth, Peterborough, Prince Edward, Rainy River, Renfrew, Simcoe, Thunder Bay, Toronto, Victoria, Waterloo, Wellington, Wentwork, York.

6. Western Canada

Manitoba, except Census Division 16; Saskatchewan, except Census Division 18; Alberta, except Census Divisions 12 and 15; British Columbia, except Districts Bulkley-Nechako, Kitimat-Stikine, Peace River-Liard, Stikine.